



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BM
30
C4
v.12
1902

Year Book

OF THE

Central Conference of American Rabbis

1902-5562

Manduca I. Sabff

YEAR BOOK

OF THE

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

... VOLUME XII ...

1902



5662

CONTAINING THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION

HELD AT

NEW ORLEANS, MAY 5-10, 1902



Ref

EM

30

C.4

1.12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Meeting Proceedings	1
Department Organization	2
Regulations and Memoranda	3
Technical Notes	4
- Properties of Iron & Steel	5
- Properties of Aluminum & Magnesium	6
- Properties of Nickel & Cobalt	7
- Properties of Lead & Tin	8
- Properties of Zinc & Cadmium	9
- Properties of Manganese & Chromium	10
- Properties of Silicon & Boron	11
- Properties of Phosphorus	12
- Properties of Sulfur	13
- Properties of Nitrogen	14
- Properties of Oxygen	15
- Properties of Hydrogen	16
- Properties of Carbon	17
- Properties of Fluorine	18
- Properties of Chlorine	19
- Properties of Bromine	20
- Properties of Iodine	21
- Properties of Barium	22
- Properties of Strontium	23
- Properties of Calcium	24
- Properties of Magnesium	25
- Properties of Aluminum	26
- Properties of Silicon	27
- Properties of Boron	28
- Properties of Nitrogen	29
- Properties of Oxygen	30
- Properties of Hydrogen	31
- Properties of Carbon	32
- Properties of Fluorine	33
- Properties of Chlorine	34
- Properties of Bromine	35
- Properties of Iodine	36
- Properties of Barium	37
- Properties of Strontium	38
- Properties of Calcium	39
- Properties of Magnesium	40
- Properties of Aluminum	41
- Properties of Silicon	42
- Properties of Boron	43
- Properties of Nitrogen	44
- Properties of Oxygen	45
- Properties of Hydrogen	46
- Properties of Carbon	47
- Properties of Fluorine	48
- Properties of Chlorine	49
- Properties of Bromine	50
- Properties of Iodine	51
- Properties of Barium	52
- Properties of Strontium	53
- Properties of Calcium	54
- Properties of Magnesium	55
- Properties of Aluminum	56
- Properties of Silicon	57
- Properties of Boron	58
- Properties of Nitrogen	59
- Properties of Oxygen	60
- Properties of Hydrogen	61
- Properties of Carbon	62
- Properties of Fluorine	63
- Properties of Chlorine	64
- Properties of Bromine	65
- Properties of Iodine	66
- Properties of Barium	67
- Properties of Strontium	68
- Properties of Calcium	69
- Properties of Magnesium	70
- Properties of Aluminum	71
- Properties of Silicon	72
- Properties of Boron	73
- Properties of Nitrogen	74
- Properties of Oxygen	75
- Properties of Hydrogen	76
- Properties of Carbon	77
- Properties of Fluorine	78
- Properties of Chlorine	79
- Properties of Bromine	80
- Properties of Iodine	81
- Properties of Barium	82
- Properties of Strontium	83
- Properties of Calcium	84
- Properties of Magnesium	85
- Properties of Aluminum	86
- Properties of Silicon	87
- Properties of Boron	88
- Properties of Nitrogen	89
- Properties of Oxygen	90
- Properties of Hydrogen	91
- Properties of Carbon	92
- Properties of Fluorine	93
- Properties of Chlorine	94
- Properties of Bromine	95
- Properties of Iodine	96
- Properties of Barium	97
- Properties of Strontium	98
- Properties of Calcium	99
- Properties of Magnesium	100

PRESS OF
WM. C. POPPER & CO.
56 READE ST., N. Y.

100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the existence of solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the existence of solutions is guaranteed if the functions $f_i(x)$ satisfy certain conditions. The second part of the paper is devoted to the construction of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) can be constructed by the method of successive approximations. The third part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The fourth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The fifth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The sixth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The seventh part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The eighth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The ninth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable. The tenth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the system of equations (1) under the conditions (2). It is shown that the solutions of the system of equations (1) are unique and stable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
List of Officers, - - - - -	5
Standing Committees, - - - - -	6
Temporary Committees, - - - - -	7
Programme of the Convention, - - - - -	8
Session of May 5, - - - - -	13
Prayer by Jacob S. Raisin, - - - - -	13
Address of Welcome by Max Heller, - - - - -	15
Address of Welcome by Mayor Capdevielle, - - - - -	18
Response by Joseph Krauskopf, - - - - -	19
Message of President Joseph Silverman, - - - - -	26
Memorial Address by Rabbi Adolph Moses, by Rabbi H. G. Enclow, - - - - -	38
Session of May 6, - - - - -	43
List of Members in Attendance, - - - - -	44
Report of Committee on Union Hymnal, - - - - -	45
Report of Committee on American-Jewish Historical Exhibit, - - - - -	48
Report of Publication Committee, - - - - -	49
Session of May 7, - - - - -	60
Report of Committee on Membership Certificate, - - - - -	61
Treasurer's Report, - - - - -	62
Session of May 8, - - - - -	70
Report on Auditing Union Hymnal Accounts, - - - - -	71
Report of Committee on Treasurer's Report, - - - - -	72
Report on Memorial Fund by Julius Weis, Esq., - - - - -	73

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

From its first settlement in 1630 to the present time. By
JOSEPH NEASE, Esq. of the Middle Temple, Barrister at Law.
In two Volumes. The first Volume contains the History from
1630 to 1700. The second Volume contains the History from
1700 to the present time. With a Plan of the City, and a
List of the Magistrates, from 1630 to 1700.

A LIST OF THE
MAGISTRATES

Year.	Magistrate.
1630	John Winthrop
1631	John Winthrop
1632	John Winthrop
1633	John Winthrop
1634	John Winthrop
1635	John Winthrop
1636	John Winthrop
1637	John Winthrop
1638	John Winthrop
1639	John Winthrop
1640	John Winthrop
1641	John Winthrop
1642	John Winthrop
1643	John Winthrop
1644	John Winthrop
1645	John Winthrop
1646	John Winthrop
1647	John Winthrop
1648	John Winthrop
1649	John Winthrop
1650	John Winthrop

STANDING COMMITTEES

FOR THE YEAR 1902—1903

ON SABBATH QUESTION

J. VOORSANGER, S. SALE, M. HELLER, G. DEUTSCH,
S. H. SONNESCHEIN, L. HARRISON, H. G. ENELOW

ON GOLDFOGLE RESOLUTION

R. GROSSMAN, S. SHULMAN, I. S. MOSES

ON JEWISH RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS

H. H. MAYER, H. G. ENELOW
W. WILLNER, M. P. JACOBSON.

ON AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORICAL EXHIBIT

M. H. HARRIS, ABRAM. S. ISAACS, LEON NELSON
ALEX. LYONS, R. GROSSMAN, JOSEPH SILVERMAN, *Ex-Officio*

ON UNAFFILIATED WITH CONGREGATIONS

JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF, M. J. GRIES, A. J. MESSING

ON PUBLICATIONS

JOSEPH STOLZ, T. SCHANFARBER, A. NORDEN

ON MEMBERSHIP CERTIFICATE

M. MIELZINER, M. MESSING, M. SAMFIELD

TRUSTEES OF SUPERANNUATED MINISTERS' FUND

I. AARON, JOSEPH SILVERMAN, E. N. CALISCH

ON UNION HYMNAL

A. KAISER, WM. LOWENBERG, WM. SPARGER
I. S. MOSES, C. RUBINSTEIN.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

E. G. HIRSCH, G. GOTTHEIL, K. KOHLER

ON TRACTS

H. BERKOWITZ, WM. ROSENAU, A. GUTTMACHER.

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY OF THE CONFERENCE

M. MIELZINER, K. KOHLER, E. G. HIRSCH
L. GROSSMANN, D. PHILIPSON.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

FOR THE YEAR 1904

POPULATION

1. Total population	1,000,000
2. Male population	500,000
3. Female population	500,000

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

4. Birth rate per 1,000	20
5. Death rate per 1,000	10
6. Marriage rate per 1,000	15
7. Divorce rate per 1,000	5

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

8. Total value of goods produced	\$1,000,000,000
9. Total value of goods sold	\$800,000,000
10. Total value of goods imported	\$200,000,000
11. Total value of goods exported	\$100,000,000

FINANCIAL DATA

12. Total value of money in circulation	\$500,000,000
13. Total value of gold in circulation	\$100,000,000
14. Total value of silver in circulation	\$400,000,000
15. Total value of paper money in circulation	\$400,000,000

EDUCATION AND LITERACY

16. Total number of schools	10,000
17. Total number of pupils	1,000,000
18. Total number of teachers	100,000
19. Total number of students	1,000,000

RELIGION

20. Total number of churches	1,000
21. Total number of worshippers	1,000,000
22. Total number of ministers	10,000
23. Total number of laymen	1,000,000

ARTS AND LETTERS

24. Total number of books published	1,000
25. Total number of copies sold	1,000,000
26. Total number of libraries	100
27. Total number of collections	1,000

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

28. Total number of scientific papers published	1,000
29. Total number of patents granted	1,000
30. Total number of inventions made	1,000
31. Total number of discoveries made	1,000

SPORTS AND RECREATION

32. Total number of sportsmen	1,000,000
33. Total number of spectators	1,000,000
34. Total number of games played	1,000
35. Total number of prizes won	1,000

GENERAL DATA

36. Total number of deaths	100,000
37. Total number of suicides	1,000
38. Total number of accidents	1,000
39. Total number of crimes	1,000

CONCLUSION

40. Total number of people in the country	1,000,000
41. Total number of people in the world	1,000,000,000
42. Total number of people in the universe	1,000,000,000,000
43. Total number of people in the galaxy	1,000,000,000,000,000

APPENDIX

44. Total number of people in the country	1,000,000
45. Total number of people in the world	1,000,000,000
46. Total number of people in the universe	1,000,000,000,000
47. Total number of people in the galaxy	1,000,000,000,000,000

INDEX

48. Total number of people in the country	1,000,000
49. Total number of people in the world	1,000,000,000
50. Total number of people in the universe	1,000,000,000,000
51. Total number of people in the galaxy	1,000,000,000,000,000

**TEMPORARY COMMITTEES ACTING FOR THE NEW ORLEANS
CONVENTION, 1902.**

ON ADOLPH MOSES RESOLUTION

C. LEVIAS, S. MANNHEIMER, M. MIELZINER.

ON DECORATION OF GRAVE OF J. K. GUTHBIM

D. MARX, L. WOLSEY.

ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

J. VOORSANGER, I. L. LEBUCHT, G. DEUTSCH,
H. COHEN, M. MESSING.

ON AUDITING UNION HYMNAL ACCOUNTS

T. SCHANFARBER, E. S. LEVY, D. MARX.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORICAL EXHIBIT

H. G. ENBLOW, H. BARNSTEIN, M. NEWFIELD.

ON AUDITING PUBLICATION COMMITTEE ACCOUNTS

M. SESSLER, F. L. ROSENTHAL, L. M. FRANKLIN.

ON RESOLUTIONS

M. HELLER, J. KRAUSKOPF, A. G. MOSES,
G. DEUTSCH, T. SCHANFARBER.

ON AUDITING TREASURER'S REPORT

I. L. LAUCHT, J. STOLZ, J. FRIEDLANDER.

ON THANKS

M. P. JACOBSON, J. S. RAISIN,
S. G. BOTTIGHEIMER, J. HERZ.

ON NOMINATIONS

I. L. LEUCHT, G. DEUTSCH, H. COHEN,
M. MESSING, . E. S. LEVY.

EDITOR OF YEAR BOOK

CLIFTON HARBY LEVY.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 5 to 10, 1902,

AT THE

Y. M. H. A. BUILDING.

PROGRAMME.

Monday, May 5th, 8 P. M.

PRAYER, - - - - - Rabbi Jacob S. Raisin, B.A.
ADDRESS OF WELCOME, - - - - - Rabbi Max Heller, M.A.
ADDRESS, - - - - - Mayor of New Orleans.
RESPONSE OF THE FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, - - - - -
Rabbi J. Krauskopf, D.D.
MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT, - - - - - Rabbi Joseph Silverman, D.D.
TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE ADOLPH MOSES, - - - - -
Rabbi H. G. Enelow, D.D.

Tuesday Morning, May 6th, 9:30 o'clock.

REPORT OF TREASURER, - - - - - Rabbi Charles S. Levi.
REPORT OF PUBLICATION COMMITTEE, - - - - - Rabbi Joseph Stolz.
REPORT OF UNION HYMNAL COMMITTEE, - - - - - Rev. A. Kaiser.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN-JEWISH HISTORICAL EXHIBIT, - - - - - Rabbi R. Grossman, D.D.

REPORT OF CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, - - - - -
Rabbi M. H. Harris, Ph.D.

10:00 O'CLOCK—PAPER—"The Jewish Religious School," - -
Rabbi H. H. Mayer.

DISCUSSION, - - - Rabbis M. P. Jacobson and S. Anspacher.

The afternoon is reserved by the local committee for an excursion on the Mississippi River.

The evening is reserved for the Y. M. H. A.

Wednesday Morning, May 7th, 9:30 o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP, Rabbi M. Mielziner, Ph.D.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UNAFFILIATED, - - - - -
Rabbi J. Krauskopf, Ph.D.

10:00 O'CLOCK—PAPER—"The Sabbath Question," - -
Rabbi Voorsanger, Ph.D., and Rabbi Leon Harrison, Ph.D.

DISCUSSION, - - - - -
Rabbi I. Lewinthal, Ph.D., and Rabbi Jacob S. Raisin, B.A.

Wednesday Afternoon, 2:30 o'clock.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS—Resolutions.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON SABBATH QUESTION.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON QUARTERLY REVIEW, - - -
Rabbi L. Grossmann, Ph.D.

4:30 O'CLOCK—VISIT TO LOCAL INSTITUTIONS.

OFFICERS

FOR THE YEAR 1902-1903

Honorary President, MOSES MIELZINER,	Cincinnati, O.
President, JOSEPH SILVERMAN,	New York, N. Y.
Vice-President, JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Treasurer, CHARLES S. LEVI,	Peoria, Ill.
Recording Secretary, ADOLF GUTTMACHER,	Baltimore, Md.
Corresponding Secretary, RUDOLPH GROSSMAN,	New York, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

JACOB VOORSANGER,	San Francisco, Cal.
H. G. ENELow,	Louisville, Ky.
TOBIAS SCHANFARBER,	Chicago, Ill.
JOSEPH STOLL,	Chicago, Ill.
L. M. FRANKLIN,	Detroit, Mich.
MAXIMILIAN HELLER,	New Orleans, La.
I. L. LEUCHT,	New Orleans, La.
G. DERTSCH,	Cincinnati, Ohio.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE.

Saturday Morning, May 10th.

UNION SERVICE OF LOCAL CONGREGATIONS AT TEMPLE SINAI.

CONFERENCE SERMON, - - - - Rabbi Joseph Stolz, D.D.

CLOSING REMARKS, - - - - - The President.

The Executive Committee will meet at the St. Charles Hotel, May 5th, at 3 P. M.

JOSEPH SILVERMAN,
President.

M. H. HARRIS,
Secretary.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Thirteenth Annual Convention
OF THE
Central Conference of American Rabbis
HELD AT
NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 5 to 10, 1902.

TEMPLE SINAI, }
Monday Evening, May 5, 1902. }

The Thirteenth Annual Convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis was opened in Temple Sinai, New Orleans, La., May 5th, 1902, at 8:00 P. M.

The session was public.

President Joseph Silverman called the Conference to order.

Rabbi Jacob S. Raisin, of Port Gibson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

"All-wise and Omniscient Spirit, great, mighty, ineffable Jehovah, in this sublime moment of the opening of the assembly of the leaders of Thy people Israel, we humbly approach Thee, and call upon Thee, Source of all Wisdom, in sincere prayer and earnest supplication. We need Thy divine assistance, the more so now, as in Thine

inscrutable mercy and justice, it has pleased Thee to recall to Thine eternal abode *ישיבה של מעלה* some of our colleagues, by whose counsel we profited, and whose wise words were to us as the distilled dew upon the herb, and as the blessed showers upon the tender grass. We need Thy guiding light, O Father of Light, to illumine our souls, to enlighten our understanding. Ah, time is fleeting, business is pressing, and without Thy kind lead, Thou who rulest the destinies of the universe and the affairs of men, our deliberations will be nothing, and our decisions 'less than nothing, and vanity'.

"Matters of the greatest importance are to be discussed in this, our Convention; pressing problems of the utmost moment await our solution. And, believing with our sages, that Thou hast given Thy holy Torah that we may live and be happy because of it; and believing, also, that Thou hast not yet revealed Thy whole will to our ancestors, but that there is continually more and more light to break forth out of Thy sacred word, we are assembled to fully discuss and fitly deliberate Thy will, and Thy word. But because of this, differences of opinion may arise in our midst, diverse views may be upheld, conflicting statements may be made. For in Thy wisdom which is past human scrutiny, Thou hast so willed that truth though crying 'at the gates at the entry of the city, at the coming in at the doors,' is yet to be obtained, like hidden treasures, only after ceaseless toil and incessant search.

"O, Lord, let not our diversity of beliefs and opinions sever us also in our aims. Be with the mouths of the leaders of Thy people. Let the love of Thy holy cause be found on their lips, and permeate their hearts. Show them what they should say, teach them what they should speak. Let this, our convention, be another illustration that we are indeed of the seed of Abraham, of the disciples of Aaron, who love peace and pursue it. Aye, let our discussions be like those of the Hillelites and Shammaites, *לשם שמים* for Thy holy name's sake, and may our different roads all lead and bring us to Thine Holy City of Truth, Peace and Loving Kindness.

"Bless, O God, all our endeavors. Bless our country in which we glorify, this city in which we meet, and its high-minded and noble-hearted men and women who are interested in our work, whose hospitality we enjoy, and who make our stay amongst them

pleasant and agreeable. Grant, O Father, that even those who do not share our religious convictions may come to recognize that one God created us all, that though we may differ in our beliefs, we can still be united by a radical identity of purpose and principle; that there is one platform at least on which we can all stand, hand in hand, and clasp hands—the principle which searches for light and accepts it, exposes wrong and opposes it, which seeks to smite evil with reason and truth, secure in the power of both. And united in sympathy and fraternity, united in aim and aspirations, may we all stand

" For the truth that lacks assistance,
For the wrong that needs resistance,
For the future in the distance—
And the good we all can do."

" Praised be Thou, O Lord, who hast kept us alive and preserved us and granted us to witness this great day of the opening of our convention. Amen."

The address of welcome was given by Rabbi Max Heller,

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY RABBI MAX HELLER.

Colleagues and Friends:

ברוך הבא בשם ד' ברכנוכם מבית ד'

" Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord; we bless you from the house of the Lord!" No fitter language could be framed, than this of the Psalmist, in which to extend to you the glad and happy welcome of our hearts. Coming, as you do, in God's name, for God's work, in the spirit of the most earnest and lofty endeavor, you are already blessed, before ever we can clasp your hands in welcome. As you gather now in this sanctuary, recognizing the colleague, meeting the friend, we bless your presence from God's house, where "in His temple all exclaimeth glory." To the personal side of our welcome the holiness surrounding may come as a constraint; to your work and its outlook this solemn environment should bring inspiration, the blessing of a realized Presence, a heart-response to the manifest Shekinah.

We welcome you, accordingly, not from idle curiosity, nor chiefly because of the privilege of your intercourse; we honor you as חורבן ורבנן our teachers and our guides. Whatever eminence or fame some of you may have earned, whatever brilliant talents or graces may adorn the one or the other, we welcome the humblest among you with the same cordiality as we do the most conspicuous. It is to your lives that we bow down, rather than to your personal achievements; it is the principle of devotion to truth and justice and humbleness which we revere in the veritable "messenger of the Lord of Hosts."

For we that "bless you from the house of the Lord" congratulate ourselves upon your selection of this Southern metropolis for your deliberations, not in the expectation, however sure that may be, of intellectual treats, of delightful converse, not even mainly because of the certain benefits of information and enlightenment which your discussions will confer upon listener and reader; we shall praise and thank you from God's house for the infecting enthusiasm, the increase of hopefulness, of Jewish loyalty and Jewish feeling which you will leave behind. It is the religious spirit of your debates and the Jewish atmosphere of your personalities which we welcome with expectant joy.

All over this country we sorely need a religious renaissance. The modern man everywhere, perhaps in America most of all, needs to round out his life into spiritual harmony by lifting the mystic well-springs of emotion and fancy to equal fellowship with domineering intellect; needs to enshrine the abstract principles of ideality beyond the acid cynicisms of hard and blind matter-of-fact; needs to temper the dull glare of despotic commonplace by the healing, many-hued rays of the inner light. We cannot build homes on the crown of the highway; nor can we build character, much less gain peace of soul, without true homes. Our liberty rests on ideals; the soundness of citizenship and of manhood is safe only in the loftiness of firm principles; we live, literally, as a commonwealth and as a culture, by the faith that is within us. (Hab. II., 4.)

Amid such surroundings the life-struggle of Judaism is a struggle for the maintenance of spiritual individuality. Allured and set upon by a thousand opposing currents, with hearts largely estranged from the ancestral manner, wavering between the duties to an

awakening, boundless world and between the homely sounds of olden soul-strains, the Jew stands baffled, torn with inward conflict, hesitating, restless, a confused and divided host. Back to medievalism he will never go; it is not in him to take refuge from hatred into darkness; as little as we shall retrace our march from railway to mail-coach, or from steamship to caravel, so little can we go back from temple to shul or from modern outlooks to the standpoints of the Responsa-literature. But we are now turning from externalities to eternities; we have begun to understand that the opposing battle-cries are no more chiefly: Reform *vs.* Orthodoxy, Saturday *vs.* Sunday, scholarship *vs.* sensationalism, but that we must raise the old rally: "Who is for the Lord, stand by me!" Our one enemy, against both ranks, is indifference, the spiritual dulness which sees no glow in faith, which feels no throb of Jewish loyalty, to which religion is cant mixed with folly, Judaism a mere dying obstinacy. We have copied the methods of American enterprise in our pulpit and congregational work: rabbi-lecturer, rabbi-orator and rabbi-organizer have had their turn; we now await the rabbi-preacher and the rabbi-guide, the men that will sway heart and will to obedience, whose personalities shall shine with the brightness of the firmament, to kindle anew the love of what is genuinely Jewish. Because we feel this yearning for a warmer and deeper enthusiasm, we have ceased to brush aside Zionism as not worth arguing; we have learned to look upon it with friendly eyes, even from the other side, as a kind of rejuvenation. The rise of the new Jewishness will be slow; for the Passover-meal of redemption must be eaten hurriedly, with nothing left for the morrow; its preparation is the readiness for travel; its solidarity the union of the family. But when we are to gather, as a whole people, around cloud-wrapt Sinai, we must make ready in purity and holiness for the morrow; a nation may be freed from human tyrannies in one midnight hour, amid confusion and hurry; it must be white-garmented and united in expectant awe around some majestic summit, if it is to be reborn in spirit. That is the lesson of this Omer-season to us who stand between the redemption and the spiritual rebirth.

And therefore do we welcome you with grateful joy "from this

house," which receives a new consecration in your solemn purpose. We welcome you as an influence for all that builds up spirituality, in worship and in life; we greet you as missionaries for all that is eternally individual and typical in Judaism, as men who have pinned their faith to the supremacy of Jewish soul-life, who stand with full conviction by the oldest banners of enduring civilization. You bring your messages from widely scattered points; each message is charged with its own experiences and convictions; they all unite in the loyal enthusiasm that has vowed its strength to one ideal aim. We shall be the better for your coming, in this sanctuary and beyond its precincts. Be also your going out blessed, even as is your coming in! Amen.

Mayor Capdevielle, of New Orleans, extended the official greetings of his city, in the following words:

MAYOR CAPDEVIELLE'S ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

"I have great pleasure in meeting here this evening the assembly of the rabbis of the United States. In our great country there is no religion of the state. There is no union between church and state. Liberty of conscience, with the right to worship in his own way, is guaranteed to every citizen. This liberality has proved the parent of public security, and is, justly speaking, the proudest feature of our American civil liberty.

"Pursuing, as you will, your deliberations according to your own choice, I anticipate for them most gratifying results to yourselves. There is no part of our population more identified with the successes of commerce than that you represent. There is none more identified with the accumulation of wealth by the exercise of industry and intelligence.

"Our hospitable people will give you a cordial reception. The selection by you of New Orleans as the place of meeting for your convention has been received everywhere among us with congratulation.

"As I understand modern Jewish history, the word rabbi is strictly applied to those who are authorized by ordination to settle

religious and ritualistic questions. I do not for a moment forget that you are the leaders of a widespread, practical philanthropy, in asylums, and hospitals, and other charitable institutions for the relief of the poor and afflicted, which are models of administration, and that our charitable people are always ready and happy to assist and to co-operate with you in your good works. And broadening in its signification, that the term rabbi is your title to an office of high distinction, as Hebrew doctors, expounders of law and teachers of your people. As such, as fellow-citizens and as friends from other states of the Union, I greet you once more, and, in the name of the people of New Orleans, bid you cordial welcome to New Orleans."

After a musical selection, Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf, of Philadelphia, Pa., responded to the speeches of welcome.

RABBI KRAUSKOPF'S RESPONSE.

Reverend Sirs of the Reception Committee and Honorable Mayor of the City of New Orleans:

You have told us, in words which we shall never forget, that we are welcome in your midst. Permit me to say, in behalf of those to whom you have offered the hospitality of your hearths and hearts, that even if you had not given utterance to a single word, we would have known that we are welcome—heartily welcome. Hospitality has no need of speech to make itself manifest. It has its own mode of communication; it has a vocabulary all its own. It articulates with the heart; it syllabalizes with the soul. With mere clasp of hand, with mere glance of eye, it soars to heights of eloquence to which even the most gifted tongue cannot wing itself.

And in no city of our land has hospitality less need of speech than in yours. Has not New Orleans become a synonym of hospitality? Have not the people of this goodly city become generally recognized as the type of Southern chivalry and Southern urbanity? The moment we entered this hall, and our eyes looked into yours, we heard your hearts speak; we knew we were among friends; we felt at home.

To a body of men like us, it is a peculiar privilege to meet in a city such as yours. Your city presents one of the best proofs of the good of religion, and one of the noblest examples of the results of the labors of the ministers of God. It is because ministers of God have labored here; it is because religion has here been implanted by godly men that your religion finds its highest expression in your hospitality; that your love of God shows itself best in your love of man; that you illustrate the truth of the teachings of our rabbis of old that hospitality is an act of divine worship; that where God is found, there, too, is found love of fellow-men, kindly treatment of the stranger, helpful aid to all engaged in the work of right and justice and truth.

And to a body of men like us it was a peculiar pleasure to listen to the words of the chief magistrate of your city. The more closely I followed his words, the more I recognized in his thoughts and sentiments that he belonged to the small number of statesmen who recognize the importance of religion to society, and the invaluable labors of the preacher for the conservation of the most sacred interests of our commonwealth, and who do all in their power to deepen and widen the usefulness of the one by encouraging and aiding the other. I have had the pleasure within the recent past of listening to a number of statesmen advocating publicly the cause of religion and championing the work of ministers. It may possibly please your honorable mayor to know that, though the number is still small, they embrace the highest types of American citizenship, among them presidents of the United States.

I have had the privilege of listening to

OUR LATE MARTYRED PRESIDENT

a number of times in public address. The most memorable utterance I ever heard him deliver was in my city, on February 22, 1898, as guest and orator of the University of Pennsylvania, on its annual Washington day. His exalted office, his distinguished bearing and his unostentatious yet forceful utterances would in themselves have sufficed to rivet upon himself the closest attention of that vast audience of representative people that had gathered

in the Academy of Music to do honor to the presence of the chief magistrate, and the memory of the founder of our nation.

But there was another and weightier reason than the one given that made the people fairly hang on the lips of the speaker on that memorable day. A crisis was pending in the nation, and on that platform of that hall, on that morning, stood and spoke the one man who, more than any other man, could decide the future destiny of the United States, and the future fate of the island of Cuba.

It was but eight days after the explosion of the Maine. The passion of the people ran high. The newspapers, especially the yellow species of them, clamored aloud for war. Amidst all that excitement, there was one man who remained calm, and that was President McKinley. Firmer than ever was his hand upon the helm. Clearer than ever was his outlook against breakers and rocks ahead. Though the gale roared and the billows dashed against the ship of state, he listened but for the voice of God in all that storm. That voice alone he would obey, be the consequences what they may.

Without directly touching upon the great issue of the hour, that was the keynote of his remarkable address, he spoke as if inspired. The vast throng of people sat awe-stricken. What was least expected on that particular morning came to pass. The president turned preacher, and took for his text the memorable words of our first president, who had likewise turned preacher at a turning point in the history of our nation, that immortal passage in the "Farewell Address of George Washington" which emphasizes the importance of religion to government in general, and to a republic in particular, in which he said:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked: Where is the security for

property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

A study of the religious and moral condition of the nation at the time of George Washington, easily proves that there was little fear in that day of an overthrow of the young republic by reason of political and moral corruptions, consequent upon a subversion of religion. The American people were then, almost as a whole, religious in heart and mind, and puritanic in their mode of life. Churches were crowded with worshipers, the day of rest was sacredly observed. Property and life were inviolable, the administration of public funds was a divine trust. There was a public as well as a private conscience. There was a due regard for rights and privileges, and a due respect for justice. There was reverence in the home, and faithfulness in society; fair treatment to wage-earner, and fair esteem of wage-giver.

Why, then, this special emphasis by our first president upon

THE SAFE-GUARDING OF RELIGION

as a means of safe-guarding the nation? Why this admonition of Washington, in his farewell address to the nation, to guard religion, above all other things, as the root of lasting national and civic prosperity, as the source of individual, domestic and social happiness? Was he, as was Moses in the closing days of his life, not only president, not only preacher, but prophet as well, foreseeing a time coming when violent hands would be laid upon religion, the heaven-descended first-born daughter of God, when the nation, blessed by God as no other nation had ever been blessed, would turn with blasphemous mouth against God, when the props upholding the people's morality would be ruthlessly knocked away, and the ghouls and sharks of political corruption would be turned loose to prey

upon the nation, with not a power to stop them, with not a fear of God or man to bid them halt?

Yea, it almost seems that Washington was prophet and preacher as well as president, when, upon thoughtful perusal of his farewell address, we consider the number of other evils he cautioned the nation against, of which there was no danger then, but which have since arisen, and which have been kept from running the nation into destruction only by putting on in time the brakes suggested by the first of our president-preachers and prophets.

And was McKinley more than president—was he preacher and prophet as well, on that day when he re-emphasized Washington's farewell admonition to the nation to cherish religion as the only guarantee of national prosperity and of individual happiness, as the only safe-guard to morality and education? Was he preacher and prophet as well, when, turning to the learned faculty of the distinguished university, and to other educators, seated on the platform, and to the thousands of students seated in the audience, and with an expression on his face that betokened inspiration, and in a tone that was instinct with alarm, cautioned them against believing that the teacher can take the place of the preacher, that the school can take the place of the church, or the text book the place of the Bible; showed them that education, to be effective, must have morality back of it, and that without religion there never was morality, and there never can be?

There was a premonition then that the hand of death was upon him, that he had been divinely chosen to demonstrate as martyr to the nation that the mind which denounces religion becomes a hotbed of anarchy, that the heart that shuts its ear to God's voice opens it wide to the serpent's hissing, that hands that cannot fold in adoration may thrust the dagger or send the bullet into the hearts of those that serve God and man? Who can tell whether

SUCH A PREMONITION WAS HIS

on that memorable day? An anarchist's, an atheist's and an assassin's bullet has silenced his lips. They will never speak to us again.

But another president has spoken to us since. Ex-President Grover Cleveland has given utterance to words, since our lamented McKinley's martyrdom, that entitle him, too, to be ranked with our president-preachers. He, too, took the occasion of a memorable day, and of a representative audience, in his McKinley memorial address before the faculty and students of Princeton University, to give expression to his fear of the danger threatening the nation from people relegating the church more and more into the background, assigning to the school a foremost place, giving the mind the highest culture, and neglecting the heart altogether.

I have cited these utterances of these men because their political prominence and their recognized knowledge of the safeguards of the nation's prosperity free their emphasis upon religion from the charge of cant, that is all too freely heaped upon preachers. When presidents of the United States urge even upon universities the necessity of religious instruction, let no one any longer accuse preachers of self-interest when they urge the same.

The day of the preacher's vindication is at hand. The church's day of tribulation is drawing to a close. Our best people, alarmed at the rapid and widespread increase of corruption, are looking to church and preacher for salvation. The day is passing in which church and preacher are obliged to resort to all sorts of baits and sugar-coating to get people to swallow religion as if it were an unpalatable pill. The day is passing when church and preacher are held to be good enough for the old or feeble or foolish, but not for the vigorous and intellectual, who boast of knowing the wrong when they see it, and succeed in doing it, too. The day is passing when bright intellects are drawn to professions other than the clergy to satisfy ambitions for profitable usefulness. It will not be long before as much money will be had for the employment of the most competent spiritual and moral teachers in religious schools, as is now had for the employment of the best talent in secular schools. It will not be long before parents will be as deeply concerned about their children's regular church attendance as they now are about their faithful attendance at school; as deeply concerned about their sons and daughters joining church as they now are about their joining this or that dancing class, or this or that social set.

Churchward now society is looking for salvation; it has long looked schoolward, and has looked in vain. The school has expanded the brain, but it has contracted the heart; it has widened intellect, but it has narrowed morality; it has admitted the sciences and philosophies and languages, but excluded God, and with him it also shut out reverence for duty, for justice and righteousness. And as a consequence, from out the courts

COMES THE LOUD CRY:

"Teach religion, for crime is increasing beyond our power of coping with it." From out the newspapers comes the loud cry: "Get the people into the church, for half of our columns are daily filled with records of violations of laws of God and man." From out the sweat-shops and tenements comes the cry: "Ye preachers, teach the people to be just!" From out the stores comes the cry: "Teach the people to be honest!" From out the homes comes the cry: "Teach the people to be dutiful and faithful!" From out overcrowded hospitals and asylums and almshouses comes the cry: "Teach the people how to live!" Out of the legislative halls comes the cry: "Teach the people how to cast, as honest citizens, honest votes for honest men!" Out of the White House of Washington comes the cry: "Teach the people that they who lay violent hands upon the nation's magistrates lay violent hands upon God!" And out of the black house of Canton, O., comes the cry: "Teach the people the horror of atheism, the accursed mother of the twin-curses, anarchy and assassination."

For the answering of that cry we have assembled in solemn conference in your hospitable city, and under your hearty welcome. The kindly spirit of your people will aid us in our work. The learning of your rabbis will guide and counsel us. The spirit of your and our departed leader, the immortal J. K. Gutheim, one of the founders of the American Rabbinical Conferences, will permeate our hearts and souls, and guide us to a clear recognition of our possibility and of our duty, in the name of Israel, for the good of humanity.

The annual message to the Conference was then delivered by President Silverman.

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT JOSEPH SILVERMAN.

This city has not been frequently favored by rabbinical conventions, the last time that an organized body of rabbis assembled here being December 29, 1885, when the "Conference of the Rabbis of Southern Congregations" convened for its second and final session. Of that august assembly the late

JAMES K. GUTHEIM

was the presiding genius—a man who was an honor and a credit to Israel and to this community and a valiant exponent of Judaism. Most of the men who rallied around him in those days were young, and looked up to that Nestor of Southern Judaism as to a teacher and guide. He was eminently fitted to lead by virtue of his learning, his accurate comprehension of the problems and conditions of the time, and a sound judgment that enabled him to further the cause of advance without separating too far from those that walked slowly behind the car of progress. Those of us who were members of that conference can recall his exquisite tact, his many wise interpretations of Jewish law, and especially his excellent paper on the "Cause, Development and Scope of Reform," which struck the keynote of the transition period of twenty and thirty years ago. Whilst we are assembled in this temple, which often resounded with his clarion voice, we are reminded of the words: *שעל נעליך מעל רגליך*: "Take off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place on which thou standest is holy ground." (Ex. iii, 5.) Tread lightly, for this is holy ground sanctified by sacred tradition and the hallowed memories of Temple Sinai's former leader.

It is fitting that this tribute be paid in this assembly, for our very presence here is due in part to the reminiscences of that Southern Conference that Gutheim called into life. There existed in the year 1885 also an Eastern Conference of Rabbis, and rumors

were then heard of a contemplated Western Conference. Geographical lines threatened to divide the American Rabbinate into sectional groups, when Isaac M. Wise conceived the idea of a Central Conference which should unite all the rabbis of the land into one organization. Dr. Wise's plan succeeded, and the Eastern and Southern Conferences were unofficially merged into the Central Association. For many reasons it is not advisable to have more than one national rabbinical association. We should meet one another hailing from various sections of the country, and if there are differences these must not be accentuated by local conferences, but harmonized by a central body. It is for this reason that we have come to New Orleans. We wish to bring the message of the East, North and West to this extreme district, and to carry back with us such a spirit and such an inspiration as will cause us all to feel that כל ישראל אחים "all Israel are brethren," irrespective of geographical divisions or even religious differences.

EVENTS OF THE PAST YEAR.

Our sessions at this time are of unusual interest in their bearing upon Judaism. The past year was one of great moment to American Judaism. History is being rapidly made for American Israel. A new impetus has been given to the consideration of Jewish questions.

Zionism has continued its agitation, yet has evinced no real progress; we do not believe that it contains that constituency or those elements of principle that are necessary for the solution of the Jewish question.

Semitic studies are being vigorously pursued in many universities and chairs, and fellowships in Semitic departments are being liberally endowed. The Alliance Israelite Universelle has made some progress in this country, and hopes to win many more Americans to its ranks. The promoters of the Jewish Encyclopedia have resumed publication, and promise, if certain expectations regarding a liberal subsidy are realized, that the work will be completed in a few years. The task is gigantic, and the public should be indulgent

with the publishers and editors for the sake of the great and lasting good that will accrue to Judaism from this monumental enterprise.

STATUS OF AMERICAN JEWS IN RUSSIA.

The condition of the Jews of Russia, and especially the status of American Jewish tourists while sojourning in the land of the Czar, has been brought before the House of Representatives by Judge Henry M. Goldfogle of New York, through the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and hereby is directed to inform this House whether American citizens of the Jewish religious faith, holding passports issued by this government, are barred or excluded from entering the territory of the empire of Russia, and whether the Russian government has made or is making any discrimination between citizens of the United States of different religious faith and persuasion, visiting or attempting to visit Russia, provided with American passports, and whether the Russian government has made regulations, restricting or specially applying to American citizens, whether native or naturalized, of the Jewish religious denomination, holding United States passports, and if so, to report the facts in relation thereto, and what action concerning such exclusion, discrimination or restriction, if any, has been taken by any department of the United States.

This resolution, whose timeliness no one can question, having been favorably acted upon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been passed by the House of Representatives. Argument is unnecessary to convince us, that it is the duty of our government to demand a strict observance of international treaties, and to protect the rights of all American citizens in whatsoever country they may travel or reside. I, therefore, propose that this Conference give a strong expression of its endorsement of this resolution and forward the same to Judge Goldfogle, together with a vote of congratulation and appreciation for the bold and courageous attitude he has taken in this matter that is of vital interest to American Israel and to every patriotic citizen. It is also advisable that the Conference take such steps as it may deem fit and helpful towards

obtaining favorable action on the part of Congress in the final disposition of the various points involved in this important question.

ORTHODOXY AND REFORM.

The past year has also become memorable because of certain tendencies and movements that have led to a better understanding between Reform and Orthodoxy. Reform is no longer an experiment or theory. It is an accomplished fact. It is a movement that is characterized not by any desire of having less religion, but rather of accentuating the great need of a Judaism that shall be in consonance with the best modern and occidental civilization. Time was when Reform was not thoroughly understood because in the heat of argument the real issue had been beclouded by bitter personalities. For the past fifty years, the objects and methods of Reform have been misconceived and often misrepresented. Reform ministers have been held up to ridicule and been belittled with an animus that injured rather than benefited the cause of Judaism. The leaders of progress, with few exceptions, have been decried; their motives have been questioned, their claims to scholarship have been denied, their methods have been denounced as iconoclastic and subversive of true religion—in short, every epithet denominative of ignorance and sinister purposes has been cast upon them. I am not unmindful of the fact that in some instances acerbic rebuttals have been indulged in on the part of the reformers. It is, therefore, all the more pleasing to note that a change has taken place in the attitude assumed toward one another, by men of different religious views. The general spirit of tolerance that prevails amongst those of different faiths and leads Catholic, Protestant and Jew to respect one another's opinions and convictions, has made itself felt also in the internal divisions of Israel. It is now accepted almost as axiomatic that at least two general interpretations of Jewish law and practice are possible and permissible—one in the light of the past, the other in the light of the present. We are agreed that men may honestly differ in religious convictions and still reach the same result—the worship of God and the salvation of man. The talmudic maxim in its broadest sense obtains

with the publishers and editors for the sake of the great and lasting good that will accrue to Judaism from this monumental enterprise.

STATUS OF AMERICAN JEWS IN RUSSIA.

The condition of the Jews of Russia, and especially the status of American Jewish tourists while sojourning in the land of the Czar, has been brought before the House of Representatives by Judge Henry M. Goldfogle of New York, through the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and hereby is directed to inform this House whether American citizens of the Jewish religious faith, holding passports issued by this government, are barred or excluded from entering the territory of the empire of Russia, and whether the Russian government has made or is making any discrimination between citizens of the United States of different religious faith and persuasion, visiting or attempting to visit Russia, provided with American passports, and whether the Russian government has made regulations, restricting or specially applying to American citizens, whether native or naturalized, of the Jewish religious denomination, holding United States passports, and if so, to report the facts in relation thereto, and what action concerning such exclusion, discrimination or restriction, if any, has been taken by any department of the United States.

This resolution, whose timeliness no one can question, having been favorably acted upon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been passed by the House of Representatives. Argument is unnecessary to convince us, that it is the duty of our government to demand a strict observance of international treaties, and to protect the rights of all American citizens in whatsoever country they may travel or reside. I, therefore, propose that this Conference give a strong expression of its endorsement of this resolution and forward the same to Judge Goldfogle, together with a vote of congratulation and appreciation for the bold and courageous attitude he has taken in this matter that is of vital interest to American Israel and to every patriotic citizen. It is also advisable that the Conference take such steps as it may deem fit and helpful towards

obtaining favorable action on the part of Congress in the final disposition of the various points involved in this important question.

ORTHODOXY AND REFORM.

The past year has also become memorable because of certain tendencies and movements that have led to a better understanding between Reform and Orthodoxy. Reform is no longer an experiment or theory. It is an accomplished fact. It is a movement that is characterized not by any desire of having less religion, but rather of accentuating the great need of a Judaism that shall be in consonance with the best modern and occidental civilization. Time was when Reform was not thoroughly understood because in the heat of argument the real issue had been beclouded by bitter personalities. For the past fifty years, the objects and methods of Reform have been misconceived and often misrepresented. Reform ministers have been held up to ridicule and been belittled with an animus that injured rather than benefited the cause of Judaism. The leaders of progress, with few exceptions, have been decried; their motives have been questioned, their claims to scholarship have been denied, their methods have been denounced as iconoclastic and subversive of true religion—in short, every epithet denominative of ignorance and sinister purposes has been cast upon them. I am not unmindful of the fact that in some instances acerbic rebuttals have been indulged in on the part of the reformers. It is, therefore, all the more pleasing to note that a change has taken place in the attitude assumed toward one another, by men of different religious views. The general spirit of tolerance that prevails amongst those of different faiths and leads Catholic, Protestant and Jew to respect one another's opinions and convictions, has made itself felt also in the internal divisions of Israel. It is now accepted almost as axiomatic that at least two general interpretations of Jewish law and practice are possible and permissible—one in the light of the past, the other in the light of the present. We are agreed that men may honestly differ in religious convictions and still reach the same result—the worship of God and the salvation of man. The talmudic maxim in its broadest sense obtains

to-day *אין מחזיקין במחלוקת* "not to emphasize or prolong differences and dissensions." This principle rigidly adhered to will open up a new era for American Judaism, heal many of the breaches of the past, and lead the two camps of Israel to direct their efforts jointly against the common foe, materialism and the modern worship of Baal.

For the sake of this noble spirit that is beginning to prevail here, I am constrained to correct an error that has reached us from England. No less an astute paper than the *Jewish Chronicle*, of London, in its issue of April 11, 1902, said editorially as follows: "There is a crisis among the Jewry of America, none the less serious because it is not the birth of to-day. Judaism in that great country is still staggering under the effects of its first contact with the brusque iconoclasm of the Western hemisphere, and the shock of the conflict has engendered what Mr. Zangwill called illogical chaos." This paragraph reveals the fact of which we were for some time cognizant, viz.: that the misconceptions and misrepresentations of American Reform Judaism had spread to Europe. We can not too emphatically deny the existence of a crisis in American Jewry and condemn the practice still indulged in of ignoring or belittling the great services rendered to Israel at large and to American Judaism in particular by those stalwart rabbis who fought for Israel's glory—and then went to their deserved rest, viz.: Merzbacher, Einhorn, Hirsch, Lilienthal, Gutheim, Isaac M. Wise and a host of others. Those men were earnest and sincere scholars, pulpit orators, modern prophets, intoxicated of God and inspired to battle for Israel's rights, for Judaism's progress and for humanity. They plowed the fallow land of American Judaism, sowed the seed of which we to-day reap the harvest, and we, therefore, can not suffer their glorious achievements to be ignominiously interred with their bones. We do not, we can not, overlook what Leeser, Kohut and Morais have done. Their names are immortal—their deeds have enhanced Israel's proud name and added lustre to Judaism's crown. Whilst we acknowledge all this, we do not think it right that the great work of other champions of Israel's cause should be ignored or underestimated. Of the living exponents of Judaism we need not speak. Their words, their deeds, their lives, their learning are the ever-present witnesses of their

services to the cause and a constant refutation of the charge that Judaism is "staggering."

In no uncertain tones let us proclaim to the world in general, and to our European brethren in particular, the glorious tidings that, far from experiencing an impending crisis, American Judaism is giving evidence of internal strength and of a spiritual growth which the Old World can hardly duplicate. Despite all vociferation to the contrary, congregations are increasing in number and power; works of charity, education and religion are multiplying and throughout the length and breadth of the land there is exhibited a hopeful and progressive spirit. Judaism in America has survived the early conflict between Orientalism and Occidental life because of a *judicious*, not an illogical, assimilation. If there was a "chaos" because of the conflict of the past generations, it was one over which the Spirit of God has moved and out of which, therefore, have come the present harmony and the prospect of more light and a new spiritual creation for modern Israel.

A true appreciation of the possibilities of our faith in this country has lately come from an unexpected source and deserves to be quoted. Zadoc Kahn, Chief Rabbi of France, has declared: "The future of universal Judaism depends, to a very great extent, on *American Judaism*. There, more than elsewhere, are life, movement, a remarkable spirit of initiative and a desire for progress."

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES.

This optimistic view is further borne out by the fact that the need of American Judaism for rabbis educated and trained in this country is so great as to require two theological colleges. The older institution, the Hebrew Union College, is national in character, being founded, organized, supported and governed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. It has already graduated seventy-five or eighty rabbis who fill important positions throughout the land. The younger institution, lately reorganized under the laws of New York as the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, will find an ample field for all the rabbis it can possibly send forth properly equipped. This seminary is happily endowed with ample

funds through the munificence of several Eastern leaders of thought, finance, education and philanthropy. It is highly creditable to American Israel that it has in its midst a few men who are sufficiently imbued with a love of Judaism to feel constrained to support an institution of Jewish learning with a liberal hand. The cry has frequently been heard that the Jew is generous in relieving suffering and physical distress, that he cares for the widow and the orphan, but that for educational institutions, especially for schools of theology, he gives only a pittance. This charge is true no longer. The Jew has always been zealous for education, and in many of our large cities educational institutions for the Americanization and training of the immigrant have been liberally endowed. New York has in many ways effectually refuted the old charge and, especially now, by this Theological Seminary which starts upon a new career well equipped for its struggle against gross ignorance and scepticism.

DR. SCHECHTER.

This seminary is also fortunate in having secured for its President the able and scholarly Dr. Solomon Schechter, of England. For this eminent Talmudist and expounder of Jewish literature we have the profoundest regard, and feel that American Israel has added another star of great magnitude to its galaxy of brilliant minds. I recommend that this Conference extend a hearty welcome to Dr. Schechter and express to him its congratulations upon his call to the Presidency of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and the hope that he will find our country so congenial to his literary tastes, his intellectual pursuits and aspirations as to induce him to make his permanent home among us.

ISAAC M. WISE MEMORIAL FUND.

The Hebrew Union College has, as yet, no patron Maecenas and must depend for future endowment upon the generosity of the people at large. Of the half million dollars that are to constitute the Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund little over one-fourth has been thus far collected. We are not here to inquire into the causes of

this failure. We have a duty to perform to this College, to Judaism, and to the memory of Isaac M. Wise, who was the founder both of the Conference and of the Hebrew Union College. Will we neglect that duty? Will we repudiate it? Will we forget the man and the Alma Mater to whom many of us are indebted for our rabbinical training? Shall American Israel be ungrateful to the memory of Isaac M. Wise and not evidence a proper appreciation of his unselfish devotion and invaluable services to Judaism? While he lived he gave his labors gratuitously to that institution and became its very soul—its life. He "made in the wilderness a way for the Lord." He created a union out of scattered congregations. He harmonized the conflicting interests of American Jewry. He fought in season and out of season for union, for the preservation of our faith. He built a college when there was none and established the precursor of the lately reorganized theological seminary. He left behind the Union, the College, professors, teachers, pupils and eighty rabbis in positions—a complete equipment to aid in giving vitality and permanence to a greater Judaism. And now that the man who wrought all this is gone, it would be a lamentable indication of lack of resources in American Israel if that monument of indomitable energy should not stand. We are tempted to cry out, "There is no leader in Israel." Have we not one man—and if not one, have we not ten, a hundred, a thousand, ten thousand men, who combined, can do what he did alone? Is a leader without an army more powerful than an army without a leader? We can, we must accomplish the task and perpetuate the heritage of Isaac M. Wise so that it redound to the glory of Israel.

Can we not from this august presence send forth such a presentation of the claims and needs of the Hebrew Union College that will appeal at once to the heart of every good Jew, awaken him to a realization of his duty and impel him to the performance of some heroic sacrifice for the lasting benefit of Judaism? I submit this proposition to your esteemed consideration. I further recommend that this Conference contribute from its treasury a generous donation to the Isaac M. Wise Fund. I also suggest that we appoint a special auxiliary committee on the Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund that shall have power to co-operate with the National Committee

appointed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations towards securing this desirable fund.

SUMMER SCHOOL.

At the convention of Buffalo the suggestion of holding a Summer School for theological and rabbinical studies was adopted and a committee of five appointed to devise a plan. This committee, through the neglect of its chairman, failed to consider the matter. I, therefore, again present the subject for your deliberation. The necessity for such a Summer School is obvious. The rabbis are too busy during the winter with their pulpit, congregational and communal activities to give much time to that technical study that is a necessary part of every rabbi's equipment. He should have an opportunity during the vacation months, in conjunction with his colleagues, of making special researches and reviews in the various fields of Jewish literature which have been unavoidably neglected during the season of practical labor. It may be possible for the Hebrew Union College to give during the month of July or August a course of post-graduate instruction of which many rabbis would avail themselves. We should decide at this session whether to apply to the Hebrew Union College for the creation of such a course or whether to institute our own summer school to be held in conjunction with our annual conventions. In either case, a committee should be appointed with full power to act at once that the work may be begun before another year has elapsed.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

In addition to the summer school, we should also undertake the publication of a Jewish Quarterly Review, as a means for the encouragement of research in the various departments of Jewish theology and literature. Regarding this subject, the proper committee will make a report.

I have, however, the honor of asking you to consider the preparation of several other important publications, to wit:

1. A Hand Book for ministers to be of service at funerals, weddings and other occasions that may arise.

2. A Book for Private Devotion, containing suitable prayers and meditations for the sick, the unfortunate, mourners, etc.
3. A Pesach Hagada that shall contain a clear exposition of the story of the Passover, and, at the same time, be sufficiently modern in tone to arouse interest in the almost abandoned Sedar service.
4. A Union Catechism or Manual for Confirmation which shall contain a plain statement of Jewish tenets and such other data of a religious and ethical character as may be regarded essential for confirmation.

AMENDMENTS.

It is my duty to present to you with the approval of the Executive Committee the following amendments to the Constitution:

(a) To Article VI, Section 1, to provide for the election of one honorary President (who shall also be a member of the Executive Board) whenever the Conference shall deem such an office desirable.

(b) To Article VI, Section 1, to provide for the election annually of three additional members of the Executive Board.

(c) To Article VIII, Section 1, to provide that this Conference shall meet annually at such time and place as the Conference or, in its failure to act, the Executive Board may decide, and that the Executive Board may have power, in case of necessity, to change both time and place by a three-fourths vote of its members.

If you indorse these amendments you may instruct the Executive Board to make the necessary verbal change in the Constitution.

MEMBERSHIP.

The Executive Board has the pleasure of reporting the election of the following new members, to wit: Rabbi G. Friedlander, of Beaumont, Texas; Rabbi Edw. S. Levy, of Selma, Ala.; Rabbi David Levy, of New Haven, Conn.; Rabbi Leo Mannheimer, of Chattanooga, Tenn.; Rabbi Frank L. Rosenthal, of Baton Rouge, La.; Rabbi Wolf Willner, of Meridian, Miss.; Rabbi J. B. Grossman, of Youngstown, O.; and Rabbi Alfred S. Moses, of Mobile, Ala.

It grieves me to announce that the past year has for us been

marred by a sad event in the demise of our esteemed brother and colleague

REV. DR. ADOLPH MOSES.

For several years he was a sufferer, yet heroically and efficiently held his post in Louisville, Ky., until the Father above summoned him to his eternal rest. He was an intrepid champion of Israel's faith, an uncompromising advocate of Reform—a loyal citizen, a devout Jew, an earnest scholar. Peace be to his memory which we shall unite in worthily honoring. I recommend that appropriate resolutions be drafted and that we express to the bereaved family our heartfelt sympathy.

PROBLEMS OF JUDAISM.

It remains for me to call attention to the important subjects that will be presented for your consideration in papers and discussions on the Bible and Modern Thought, the Sabbath, Opportunities of the Religious School and Congregational Activities Outside of Pulpit and School. These topics are vital to Judaism and will enlist the interest of all thinking people. I would urge that the discussions take on not only an academical, but also a practical character. The people are desirous of knowing what attitude to assume with reference to the Bible, how much to accept as authoritative and binding and how much as merely allegorical and suggestive; whether Sabbath observance can be promoted and if so in what way; what shall be the province of the religious school and how its instruction can be made effective enough to counteract the general practices that are inconsistent therewith, and finally, what line shall be drawn regarding societies, classes and clubs that may be conducted in connection with congregational work.

PROVINCE OF THE RABBI.

These subjects, by no means exhaust the problems that are presented to modern Judaism. The province of the rabbi, his rights, privileges and duties have never been clearly defined and

here lies, perhaps, an element of weakness in the Jewish Rabbinate. Shall the Jewish minister be teacher, pastor and servant, or shall he be the actual leader of the congregation, unhampered by petty interference on the part of the ignorant, arrogant and officious? There seems to be no doubt as to what he ought to be, namely, the teacher and prophet, the spiritual guide and leader. And yet, in many congregations the minister is not given that free scope that is necessary for success. It is advisable that we adopt an unequivocal declaration, that the rabbi is and ought to be the recognizable spiritual head of the congregation, for with increased responsibility come enlarged scope and power.

THE SCOPE AND AUTHORITY OF THE CONFERENCE.

It seems to me also advisable that this Conference should place itself in touch with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in order to devise some plan by which its deliberations may receive proper recognition from congregations and its decisions be regarded as authoritative. In the absence of a Synod or Sanhedrin, the Conference ought, in a measure, to be that central body whose duty it shall be to give a decisive interpretation of Jewish law and practice, and determine what united course of action congregations shall adopt. What has been done with regard to bringing uniformity into divine service by the Union Prayer Book and Union Hymn Book can also be accomplished in many other directions, as for instance, proselytism, intermarriage, interment of non-Jews in Jewish cemeteries, cremation, funeral customs, observances of certain religious rites, as fasting, the eating of the matzoth, the observance of the dietary laws, etc. On some of these subjects we have declared our attitude but we have taken no steps to make our position known or felt in the community at large. I propose that this important matter be entrusted to a special committee whose duty it shall be to consider the possibility and the means of extending the scope and increasing the authority of the Conference.

I take pleasure in thanking the officers and members for the many courtesies that were extended to me during the past year.

which belong solely to Wisdom's favorite sons. The many-sidedness of his learning, its depth, its genuineness, could not but impress even his most casual hearer or acquaintance. This, I say, is matter of common knowledge. But not so familiar may be the fact that the man we are now lamenting was a scholar in the higher and more especial sense. Not only had he gathered in the spacious store-house of his mind the treasures of a most versatile culture; not only had he managed in the pursuit of his rabbinic ideal to combine, in a measure truly unique, learning both ancient and modern, sacred and profane, literary and scientific, counting both the Bible and Homer among his fondest companions, and taking similar delight in Talmudic lore and in Shakespeare as well as in Dante and Goethe; but more also! He possessed the instinct, the conscience, of the scientist. So deeply dominated was he by the yearning for Truth, that mere ordinary culture could not satisfy his spirit; nay, his intellect was a scientific plummet, sounding knowledge to the very bottom. Thus, whatever branch of learning had engaged his attention, he gave himself up to with all his heart and all his soul, pouring into it his whole devotion, trying to search out all its mysteries, to look into its inner recesses, as a lover's gaze might seek entrance into the most hidden chambers of his mistress' soul. His scholarship was sound, despite the wide realm which it embraced, despite the fact that he paid homage to so many heterogeneous forms of wisdom; to the versatile literature of the Jews and to the Greek classics, to philosophy and poetry, and to anthropology and medicine as well. Nay, not only was his mind a repository of learning old and new, a treasury of traditional lore, not only did he emblem Sinai, in the old rabbinic terminology, but also he was an acute thinker, a judicious critic, a Tearer of Mountains—again to use the rabbinic phrase—and his studies in Biblical criticism and in the origins of divers superstitions have gained honor and praise, both here and abroad. What a pity that the host of critical ideas and suggestions with which his mind teemed even to the last, even while the shadow of death was across his path, were not written down, and thus are lost to us! But even a collection of the critical articles published by our departed colleague would at once be a noble monument to his memory and

show how truly he kept up and continued the highest tradition of the rabbi—the tradition of scholarship.

And yet Dr. Moses was not merely a man of books, a votary of wisdom. His devotion to learning and letters enhanced his fitness for the leadership of men. Adolph Moses, to the majority of his associates, to the multitude of his admirers, was known chiefly as the minister, as guide of spirits, prop of souls, illuminer of gloom, as friend and master turning many from sin, turning many to love and righteousness. To whom of those present need I tell this, to whom repeat it? All those that knew him, all those that heard him, all those that unbosomed to him their spiritual troubles, their doubts and difficulties, are well aware that not only a scholar was Adolph Moses, but also a comforter, a prophet, a soul-minister in the truest sense. I know that there are many men and women, both within and without the congregations which he guided, at Montgomery and Mobile and Louisville, whose lives were moulded, whose aims were raised, whose souls were awakened, whose hearts were cleansed by the nighness of Dr. Moses, by his teachings and his eloquence. Truly,

"Some hearts for truth and goodness he *did* gain,
He charmed some grovellers to uplift their eyes,
And suddenly wax conscious of the skies."

All this he could do, for he taught and charmed both by scholarship and spiritual sympathy, and by his own pattern. His preaching was beautiful, and beautiful was his practice also. As his sermons were full of brightest hope and sublimest vision, so his life was deeply spiritual. It was idealism incarnate, unmarred by any quest of material gain or advantage. It was a pure sun unsullied by gross ambition—and many thence have derived warmth and cheer, glow and joy and the hope of life.

Adolph Moses was the most nobly ambitious man it has been given me to know. Within him burned ambition, not of the ordinary vulgar sort which concerns itself with riches and empty show and temporal triumphs, but the ambition of immortality. He was swayed by the ambition to do something, to teach something, which would insure "his continuance far beyond the

concern!" 'Tis well, then, that Adolph Moses was an unforgettable man; that once to have beheld his splendor, once to have been pierced by his luminous eye, once to have been stirred by his eloquence, once to have been touched by his spirit, meant never to forget him. And thus we shall have thee before our eyes always, our master who now dwellest among the saints; thus we shall ever bear in mind, ever treasure in our souls, the image of thy life, the voice of thy instruction.

"Thy soul was like a star, and dwelt apart:
 Thou hadst a voice whose sound was like the sea:
 Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,
 So didst thou travel on life's common way,
 In cheerful godliness; and yet thy heart
 The lowliest duties on herself did lay."

We shall remember thy learning, thy piety, thy ambition, thy child-like simplicity, and as in life so now also thou wilt be our guide, our teacher, our comforter, our colleague and friend. Amen.

Rabbi I. L. Leucht, of New Orleans, La., arose, and, in a feeling manner, referred to the unfortunate accident that had occurred during the day to the venerable Rev. Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, La., a Presbyterian minister, honored and beloved by all sects and creeds, who had always been a true friend of the Jewish people. He moved that the Conference and the large audience present rise, and thereby express its sympathy with Dr. Palmer, and pray for his speedy recovery. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Y. M. H. A. BUILDING. }
 Tuesday Morning, May 6, 1902. }

The President called the Conference to order at 9:30 A. M.

Rabbi Wolf Willner, of Meridian, Miss., opened the session with a prayer, in Hebrew.

Rabbi A. G. Moses, of Mobile, was appointed Assistant Secretary.

Secretary Guttmacher called the roll. The following responded:

LIST OF MEMBERS PRESENT.

H. Barnstein, A. Brill, H. Cohen, G. Deutsch, H. G. Enelow, L. M. Franklin, J. Friedlander, A. Guttmacher, J. Herz, M. Heller, M. P. Jacobson, I. L. Leucht, D. Marx, H. H. Mayer, M. Messing, I. S. Moses, A. G. Moses, M. Newfield, M. Sessler, J. S. Raisin, S. Sale, T. Schanfarber, J. Silverman, S. H. Sonneschein, J. Stolz, J. Voorsanger, L. Wolsey, E. S. Levy, L. Mannheimer, W. Willner, S. G. Bottigheimer, F. L. Rosenthal, W. H. Greenburg, J. Krauskopf.

Telegrams were received from the following members, unable to attend:

M. Gries, W. S. Friedman, A. Kaiser, D. Philipson, H. Berkowitz, L. Harrison, R. Grossman, L. Grossmann, M. Margolis, S. Greenfield, M. Landsberg, C. S. Levi, S. Hecht, I. Lewinthal, M. Mielziner.

The President appointed the following committee on President's Message: J. Voorsanger, I. L. Leucht, G. Deutsch, H. Cohen, M. Messing.

The floor being accorded to Mr. Sam Blum, Chairman of the local Arrangement Committee, the announcement of the following entertainments of the Conference was made: Luncheon to be served daily by the Committee of Ladies. On Tuesday afternoon, excursion on Mississippi River. Tuesday evening, entertainment at Young Men's Hebrew Association. Wednesday evening, banquet at West End Hotel. Thursday evening, entertainment at Harmony Club. The announcements were received with thanks, and referred to the proper committee for due acknowledgment.

The Report of the Treasurer, Chas. S. Levi, not having arrived, it was moved and adopted that the report be heard at the Wednesday morning session. Rabbi J. Stolz was appointed

assistant Treasurer, to act during the present meeting, and to receive dues.

Rabbi A. Guttmacher, presented the report of the Union Hymnal Committee in the absence of the Chairman, A. Kaiser.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNION HYMNAL.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, New Orleans, La.

GENTLEMEN:—Your committee begs to report that the demand for Hymnals has greatly increased since the last session of the Conference owing, we believe, to the resolution passed at that session to permit the Hymnal to remain undisturbed for a long period of time, so as to allay the fears of many that the book might shortly undergo a change and thus cause thousands of copies now in use to become valueless. From the detailed report hereto annexed it will be observed that 1,273 copies have been sold since the last session, that our entire indebtedness has been paid off, that a surplus in cash of \$153.58 is now on hand, and that only two accounts, one of \$20 and one of \$35, remain outstanding. We were pleased to hear from many quarters that the Hymnal is giving great satisfaction, and is especially serviceable at children's services where it is used in connection with prayers from the Union Prayer Book. Many tunes have already become great favorites with young and old and enhance fervor and devotion wherever and whenever intoned. We are confident that the book will continue to grow in popularity and will not only become a source of much comfort to worshipers, but also of considerable revenue to the Conference.

Respectfully,

ALOIS KAISER.

P. S.—Appended is the financial statement.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF UNION HYMNAL ACCOUNT.

COVERING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 8, 1901, TO MAY 1, 1902.

		SALES.			
1901.	NAME.	COPIES.	PAID.	OUT- STANDING.	
July 8,	Rev. P. Jacobs, Albuquerque, N. M.	1	\$ 50	
July 23,	Bloch Pub. Co., New York, $\frac{1}{2}$ % off...	250	83 34	
July 26,	Rev. D. Levine, Syracuse, N. Y.	1 and postage	60	
Sept. 4,	Hebrew Shelt. & Guard. Soc., N. Y..	50	20 00	
Sept. 24,	H. Malinow, Los Angeles, Cal.	4	2 00	
Oct. 2,	Oheb Shalom Cong., Baltimore, Md.	50	17 50	
Oct. 4,	Rabbi A. Brill	12	6 00	
Oct. 8,	Temple Emanuel, New York.	200	70 00	
Oct. 8,	Rabbi H. Levi, Wheeling, W. Va. ...	100	35 00	
Oct. 16,	Rabbi Chas. S. Levi, Peoria, Ill.	50	20 00	
Oct. 17,	Bloch Pub. Co., New York, $\frac{1}{2}$ % off..	30	10 00	
Oct. 17,	Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo.	50	20 00	
Oct. 23,	Bloch Pub. Co., New York, $\frac{1}{2}$ % off..	50	16 67	
Oct. 25,	Rev. Dr. A. Guttmacher, Balt., Md..	50	20 00	
Oct. 29,	Rev. Dr. R. Grossman, New York...	25	12 50	
Nov. 4,	H. Malinow, Los Angeles, Cal.	3	1 50	
Nov. 7,	E. H. Guttman, New Orleans, La. ...	6 and post- age.	3 48	
Nov. 14,	Bloch Publishing Co., New York....	50	16 67	
Nov. 13,	E. H. Guttman, New Orleans, La. ...	8 and post- age.	4 64	
Nov. 20,	E. H. Guttman, New Orleans, La. ...	4	2 00	
Nov. 22,	Miss Hamburger, New York.	Sample	
Nov. 22,	Rev. D. Levine, Syracuse, N. Y.	Sample	
Nov. 23,	H. Malinow, Los Angeles, Cal.	3	1 50	
Nov. 26,	Rev. Dr. S. Sale, St. Louis, Mo.	\$20 00	
Nov. 26,	E. H. Guttman, New Orleans, La. ...	1	Lost in the Mail.	
Dec. 3,	H. Malinow, Los Angeles, Cal.	4	2 00	
1902.					
Jan. 4,	H. Malinow, Los Angeles, Cal.	6	3 00	
Jan. 27,	Rev. Dr. R. Grossman, New York..	6	3 00	
Jan. 27,	E. H. Guttman, New Orleans, La. ...	2 and ex- pressage.	1 25	
Jan. 14,	Bloch Pub. Co., New York, $\frac{1}{2}$ % off..	25	8 43	
Feb. 17,	Emanuel Sisterhood, N. Y., @ \$1.00.	50	17 50	
March 13,	Rabbi A. Brill	30	15 00	
March 17,	Mizpah Cong., Chattanooga, Tenn. ...	100	35 00	
Total		1,273	\$413 99	\$55 00	

APPENDED STATEMENT.

RECEIPTS.

Balance in Treasury, July 2, 1901.....	\$30 77
Outstanding Accounts Collected.....	38 83
Receipts from Sales up to Date	413 99
Total.....	<u>\$483 59</u>

DISBURSEMENTS.

Stamped Envelopes for Circulars.....	\$4 00
Printing Circulars.....	2 50
Wm. C. Popper, on account.....	75 00
Wm. C. Popper, on account.....	125 00
Wm. C. Popper, on account.....	100 00
Wm. C. Popper, for postage, expressage and packing...	20 53
Order Book.....	1 25
Postage to A. Kaiser to January 2, 1902.....	1 06
Postage to A. Kaiser to May 1, 1902.....	67
	<u>\$330 01</u>
Balance in hand of Treasurer, May 1, 1902	153 58
Total.....	<u>\$483 59</u>

SUMMARY.

Cash Balance in Treasury, May 1, 1902.....	\$153 58
Outstanding.....	55 00
335 Copies, Stock at \$ $\frac{35}{100}$	118 25
218 Plates at \$ $\frac{25}{100}$	562 80
	<u>\$889 63</u>

Liabilities: None.

ALOIS KAISER.

On motion of Dr. Deutsch, the report was referred to an Auditing Committee. The President appointed on this committee, T. Schanfarber, E. Levy, D. Marx.

The report of the Committee on Jewish Historical Exhibit was presented, R. Grossman, Chairman, having sent the report to be read.

On motion, the report was referred to the following committee: H. G. Enelow, H. Barnstein, M. Newfield, which reported as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN-JEWISH HISTORICAL EXHIBIT.

To the President and the Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

GENTLEMEN:—Your Committee on the American Jewish Historical Exhibit begs leave to endorse the recommendations made by the committee appointed at the last Conference in Philadelphia, viz.:

That a special committee of three be appointed to take in charge the preparation of a bibliography of American Jewish Religious Works, and also the collection of such works so far as this may be found feasible for purpose of exhibition at the American Jewish Historical Exhibit to be held some time in 1903. This special committee to act in conjunction with the Committee on Bibliography of the American Jewish Historical Society.

Respectfully submitted,

H. G. ENELOW,
H. BARNSTEIN,
M. NEWFIELD.

The Corresponding Secretary, M. H. Harris, sent his report to be read. It was in effect:

The principal work of the Corresponding Secretary during the past year has been expended upon the preparation of the Year Book, which is briefer than that of 1900 and will cost less. It is suggested that a stenographer be employed to take an accurate report of the proceedings of all meetings, and that these reports be sent to the Committee on Year Book.

Dr. Deutsch suggested that the proceedings should be exactly and fully reported. The reports were important, since they would in time furnish historical information, as has been the case with the reports of the first German Rabbinical Conference.

The Report of the Publication Committee was read by J. Stolz, Chairman.

REPORT OF THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

NEW ORLEANS, May 6, 1902.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Publication Committee entrusted with the printing and handling of the publications of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, exclusive of the Year Book and of the Hymnal, beg leave to report as follows, for the ten months, from June 26, 1901, to April 25, 1902:

During the period we bound, by order of the Executive Committee, 2,396 copies of the sixth edition, viz.:

Vol. I.—Cloth	907
II.—Cloth	990
II.—Leather	499
The cost amounted to	\$427 50

Since the last report the following congregations adopted the Union Prayer Book:

Savannah, Ga.; Providence, R. I.; Congregation Beth Elohim, Brooklyn; Congregation Beth Israel, Hartford.

During this period of ten months, 4,318 volumes were sold, 113 volumes more than during the preceding twelve months, viz.:

Vol. I.—Cloth	1,377
Leather	398
Morocco	78
Extra Morocco	64
Total	1,917
Vol. II.—Cloth	1,237
Leather	210

Morocco	55
Extra Morocco.....	39
<hr/>	
Total	1,541
Unbound Volumes I. and II.....	410
Sabbath Services	450

Twenty copies of the Mourners' Service were also sold and eleven copies of the bound Sermon Book; the total value of sales being \$3,421 58.

Accordingly, in less than eight years, 50,980 copies have been purchased and the ritual has been introduced into 162 congregations, embracing nearly every important congregation throughout the length and breadth of the land.

This is a most telling proof that the book satisfies the longing which had existed in our congregations for a uniform ritual and is sufficient testimony to the intrinsic value of the book. The congregations are satisfied; while other rituals have appeared since 1895 not a single congregation that had adopted the Union Ritual has abandoned its use; it answers to the spiritual yearnings and faithfully represents the religious conceptions of our Americanized Jewish congregations. Experience may have disclosed to some the advisability of a slight change here and there, and individual taste may possibly prefer the modification of one or the other expression, although the Publication Committee has not received a single response to the invitation extended the members to send suggestions of amendments.

The favorable reception of the book, however, proves that the writer in the *American Journal of Theology* was correct when he said (April, 1902, p. 278): "Should any one desire to know of the latest development of the ancient faith, let him secure copies of these books (Union Prayer Book), for in addition to adaptations and paraphrases of the old formulas he will find there prayers and meditations of modern authorship in which the ideals and aspirations of the Judaism of to-day are freely and fully expressed. Thus he may learn from the best authority how far the Reform

Jew is in touch with the Zeitgeist; how much of the old leaven still clings to him, and how he reconciles such concepts as 'the chosen people' or 'God's covenant with Israel,' or 'the Messianic mission,' with the larger views that he professes elsewhere in regard to things human and divine."

The cash receipts, which are remitted monthly by the Secretary of the Publication Committee to its Chairman, and by him to the Treasurer, amounted to \$3,384 27; only \$117 86 less than for the preceeding twelve months. Our outstanding accounts amount to \$779 18.

The inventory shows the following stock on hand:

Vol. I.—Cloth	240
Leather.....	22
Morocco	211
Extra Morocco.....	
Vol. II.—Cloth	
Leather.....	
Morocco.....	690
Extra Morocco.....	229
Mourners' Services	411
Sabbath Services	0
Bound Sermon Books	113
Unbound Sermon Books	945
Unbound Prayer Books, Vol. II.....	1,675

Total value, less 20% discount, and 20% commission,
\$3,598 40.

It will be necessary to publish at once a seventh edition and we recommend that of Vol. I, 5,000 copies; Vol. II, 5,000 copies, and of the Sabbath Service, 2,000 copies be printed and as many bound as will be needed for one year's sales.

We are again indebted to our Secretary, Rabbi Isaac S. Moses, for his faithful and valuable services and we recommend that as in former years the appointment of a Secretary be referred to the Executive Committee with power to act.

RECEIPTS.

DISBURSEMENTS.

ASSETS.

LIABILITIES.

JOSEPH STOLZ,
TOBIAS SCHANFARBER.

A. P. POLITZER,
Expert Accountant.

**ANNUAL REPORT OF PUBLICATION COMMITTEE FROM
JUNE 26, 1901, TO APRIL 25, 1902.**

OUTSTANDING ACCOUNTS, CONSIDERED GOOD.

Ledger
Folio.

29	A. Kline, Denver, Col.....	\$20 00
31	M. Weinstein, San Antonio, Tex.....	80
33	W. Willner, Meridian, Miss.....	12 40
34	Rabbi Elzas, Charleston, S. C.....	80
42	Rabbi Meyer, Milwaukee, Wis.....	20 00
46	A. L. Goldman, Norfolk, Va.....	16 40
50	The Temple, Cleveland, Ohio.....	20
54	L. Young, Montgomery, Ala.....	10 20
60	B. A. Heineman, Kansas City.....	27 20
62	M. Schwab, St. Paul, Minn.....	12 80
64	L. Lowenthal, Chattanooga, Tenn.....	20 00
70	A. M. Kaufman, Shreveport, La.....	4 80
71	L. Glazier, Syracuse, N. Y.....	9 20
72	Rabbi Enelow, Louisville, Ky.....	10 80
73	Rabbi Aaron, Buffalo, N. Y.....	3 00
77	Rabbi Klein, Columbus, Ohio.....	4 80
78	S. Weiler, Chicago, Ill.....	4 00
83	Rabbi Marcuson, Macon, Ga.....	6 65
84	Rabbi Feuerlicht, Owensboro, Ky.....	2 40
86	Rabbi Lewinthal, Nashville, Tenn.....	63
100	Rabbi Elkin, Newburgh, N. Y.....	1 60
103	Rabbi Housman, Providence, R. I.....	45 80
111	Is. Cohen, Gainesville, Texas.....	2 40
113	Rabbi Willner, Brooklyn.....	25
114	Mrs. Aletrino, New Orleans, La.....	9 60
116	Bloch Pub. Co., New York City.....	479 65
122	Dr. Chapman, Schenectady, N. Y.....	5 60
128	Leo Wise, Cincinnati, Ohio.....	80

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF

129	J. M. Magil, Corsicana, Texas.....	\$9 60
131	Rabbi Bottigheimer, Natchez, Miss.....	1 60
133	Rabbi L. Weiss, Palestine, Texas.....	35 20
157	H. Malinow, Los Angeles, Cal.	10 80

\$779 18

1901.

SALES.

July.....	\$358 35
August.....	870 80
September.....	802 28
October.....	315 50
November.....	126 40
December.....	186 75

January.....	104 05
February.....	221 40
March.....	212 45
April.....	223 60

Total..... \$3,421 58

CASH RECEIVED.

1901.

July.....	\$235 60
August.....	119 60
September.....	411 20
October.....	714 20
November.....	563 50
December.....	369 47

1902.

January.....	193 70
February.....	202 50
March.....	154 40
April.....	420 10

Total..... \$3,384 27

CASH SENT TO C. S. LEVI, TREASURER.

1901.	
October 21.....	\$760 40
November 26.....	714 20
1902.	
January 16.....	563 50
February 6.....	350 27
March 20.....	415 40
April 8.....	154 40
April 29.....	426 10
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$3,384 27
June 26, 1901, Cash balance on hand with I. S. Moses..	
Expended to Accountant.....	\$176 18 15 00
<hr/>	
April 25, 1902, Cash balance on hand	\$161 18

SALES.

Cloth Vol. I, sales.....	1,397
Gratis.....	4
<hr/>	
	1,401
Less returned books.....	31
<hr/>	
	1,370
Gratis to Congregation	7
<hr/>	
	1,377
Leather, Vol. I, sales	378
Gratis.....	1
Shortage claimed and given to officers of congregations.	21
<hr/>	
	400
Less returned books.....	2
<hr/>	
	398

Morocco, Vol. I, sales.....	73
Gratis.....	1
Shortage claimed.....	6
	<hr/>
	80
Less returned books.....	2
	<hr/>
	78
Extra Morocco, Vol. I, sales.....	63
Gratis.....	2
	<hr/>
	65
Less returned books.....	1
	<hr/>
	64
Cloth, Vol. II, sales.....	1,228
Gratis.....	2
To officers of congregation.....	7
	<hr/>
	1,237
Leather, Vol. II, sales.....	210
Gratis.....	1
	<hr/>
	211
Returned book.....	1
	<hr/>
	210
Morocco, Vol. II, sales.....	54
Gratis.....	1
	<hr/>
	55
Extra Morocco, Vol. II, sales.....	38
Gratis.....	1
	<hr/>
	39
Total Prayer Books disposed of.....	3,458
Sabbath Service, sales.....	450

AMERICAN RABBIS.

57

Mourners', sales.....	20
Bound Sermon Book, sales	11
Unbound Prayer Books, sales	410
Total Sales.....	4,249

Stock of Prayer Books, etc., on hand June
26, 1901, as per last year's report, folios
71 and 72, net.....\$5,797 92

Added to stock during 1901-1902:

Vol. I.—Cloth,	907 @ \$1 00.	\$907 00	
Vol. II.—Cloth,	990 @ 1 00.	990 00	
Leather,	499 @ 1 50.	748 50	
	2,396	\$2,645 50	
Less 20% and 20%.....	952 38	1,693 12	
		\$7,491 04	

Credit for above 2,396 unbound Prayer Books @ 60 cents.....	\$2,037 60	
Less 20%	407 52	1,630 08
		\$5,860 96

Add Sabbath Services, plus in stock, 32 @ 25 cents.....	\$8 00	
Less 20%	1 60	6 40

Total net amount of stock to ac-
count for during 1901 and 1902.....\$5,867 36

Stock and Assets on hand April 25, 1902:

Vol. I.—Cloth,	240 @ \$1 00.	\$240 00
Leather,	22 @ 1 50.	33 00
Morocco,	211 @ 2 00.	422 00
Ex. “	69 @ 2 50.	172 50

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF

Vol. II.—Cloth,	120 @ \$1 00.	\$120 00	
Leather,	585 @ 1 50.	877 50	
Morocco,	696 @ 2 00.	1,392 00	
Ex. "	229 @ 2 50.	572 50	
	<hr/>		
	2,172	\$3,829 50	
Less 20% and 20%.....		1,378 62	
		<hr/>	\$2,450 88
Mourners' Services,	411 @ \$0 25.	\$102 75	
Sabbath Services,	none.		
Bound Sermon B'ks,	113 @ 1 00.	113 00	
Unb'd Sermon B'ks,	945 @ 25.	236 25	
Unb'd Prayer B'ks,	1,675 @ 60.	1,005 00	
	<hr/>		
		\$1,457 00	
Less 20% and 20% of \$113.00		\$40 68	
Less 20% of \$1,344.....	268 80	309 48	1,147 52
		<hr/>	\$3,598 40
April 25, 1902, Cash in hands of I. S. Moses.....			161 18
Plates.....			1,150 00
Accounts collectible as per statement ...			779 18
Accounts uncollectible \$560.30 cancelled.			
		<hr/>	
Total assets.....			\$5,688 76

NEW YORK, April 30, 1902.

Central Conference of American Rabbis.

GENTLEMEN:—Having made a careful examination of the books of accounts of Rev. I. S. Moses concerning the publication of the Union Prayer Book, and the above Annual Statement herewith submitted, I am pleased to testify to their correctness in all respects.

Very respectfully,

A. P. POLITZER,
Expert Accountant.

On motion, the report was referred to the following committee: M. Sessler, F. L. Rosenthal, L. M. Franklin, who reported:

NEW ORLEANS, May 7, 1922.

The undersigned committee after a careful examination of the report of the Publication Committee beg leave to say that the report in all its details gives assurance of the great zeal and interest the public is manifesting in our publications, and we fully endorse the recommendations therein mentioned as to publishing the various Sabbath and Holy Day Prayer Books.

Respectfully submitted,

M. SESSLER, *Chairman.*

LEO. M. FRANKLIN,

F. L. ROSENTHAL.

A letter was received from Rev. Dr. B. Felsenthal, of Chicago, Ill., wherein he thanked the Conference for their official expression of congratulations upon his eightieth birthday, delivered by Rabbi T. Schanfarber. On the motion of J. Voorsanger, messages of greeting were sent to Dr. Felsenthal and Dr. Mielziner.

The President then appointed the following, as a Committee on Resolutions, M. Heller, J. Krauskopf, A. G. Moses, G. Deutsch, T. Schanfarber.

A letter was then read from Mr. William Beer, the Librarian of the Howard Memorial Library, of New Orleans, inviting the Conference to visit the institution.

Mr. Max Senior, the President of the National Association of Jewish Charities, invited the members of the Conference to attend the second meeting of that organization, at Detroit, Mich., on May 26—28.

Both invitations were referred to the Committee on Thanks.

A request from Col. S. D. Boyd, President of the State University, at Baton Rouge, for one of the rabbis to speak before the student body, was accepted, and the President empowered to appoint a speaker. G. Deutsch was appointed.

On motion of J. Stolz, the following telegram was sent to the Western Unitarian Conference meeting at Chicago :

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in convention assembled at New Orleans, send congratulations and greetings to the Western Unitarian Conference. "May you grow from strength to strength, and the glory of your second half century surpass the splendor of the first."

Rabbi H. G. Enelow moved that the Conference adopt a resolution encouraging and sanctioning the effort of the Jewish Women's Council of Louisville, Ky., to publish a volume of the writings of the late Adolph Moses. The motion was adopted.

J. S. Raisin suggested a resolution in memory of Solomon Mandelkern, of Leipzig. Referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Rabbi H. H. Mayer, of Kansas City, then read a paper on Jewish Religious Schools. (See Appendix.)

The discussion which followed was led by M. P. Jacobson, and participated in by the following: Max Heller, H. G. Enelow, G. Deutsch, S. Sessler, W. Willner, L. M. Franklin, S. H. Sonneschein, I. S. Moses, H. Cohen, S. Sale, J. Stolz, I. L. Leucht and closed by M. P. Jacobson and H. H. Mayer. (See Appendix.)

The Conference then adjourned for the day for a trip on the Mississippi River, as the guests of Mr. William Adler.

In the evening the Conference was entertained by the Y. M. H. A.

WEDNESDAY MORNING.

The Conference was called to order at 9:30 A. M.

Rabbi Mayer Messing opened the session with prayer.

Rabbi David Marx, of Atlanta, suggested in a few eloquent words that the Conference place a wreath on the grave of Rabbi J. K. Gutheim. On the second of Rabbi Voorsanger, the suggestion was adopted, and Rabbis Marx and Wolsey were appointed a committee to place the floral tribute upon the tomb.

The report of the Committee on Membership Certificate, Chairman Dr. M. Mielziner, was received, which stated that only one person had applied to the committee for the certificate of Rabbi.

Dr. Deutsch, in discussing the report, called for a clear enunciation of the principles governing an application for a certificate. He believed the Executive Committee should grant the certificate only after an examination of the scholarly merits of the applicant. Such a certificate entitled the holder to practice all rabbinical functions.

Rabbi I. S. Moses contended that three years of service, as a rabbi, should entitle a person to the certificate. The Conference should not be a closed corporation, but should be lenient. It should not insist too much on an examination. Many rabbis, without academic training, were of such calibre that they ought to be welcomed.

Dr. Mielziner's report was adopted. The President then interpreted the conditions, to the effect that all applications should be referred to the Executive Board, who can grant a certificate, but who, in case of doubt, should refer the same to the Committee on Membership Certificate.

On motion of Rabbi G. Deutsch, the President's interpretation was recorded in the minutes.

Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger then presented his paper on the Sabbath Question. (See Appendix.)

After its conclusion, I. L. Leucht moved that, to facilitate the discussion, the various speakers, *pro* and *con*, send in their names to the Chairman. The motion was lost.

M. Heller announced that I. Lewinthal had sent his paper to him to be read, as he might not be able to get to New Orleans in time. The Chair ruled that the paper should be held, pending I. Lewinthal's arrival.

Jacob S. Raisin was the first speaker to discuss the paper of the day, followed by others. (See Appendix.)

Rabbi L. Harrison sent a letter giving the cause of his non-attendance and asked permission to have his paper read. This being granted, the paper was read by A. Guttmacher.

The report of the Treasurer was then received and on motion referred to an Auditing Committee, consisting of I. L. Leucht, J. Stolz and J. Friedlander.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

JULY, 1901, TO MAY 1, 1902.

To the Honorables, the President, Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN:—I have the honor to submit to your careful consideration the annual report of your Treasurer for the ten months beginning July, 1901, and ending May 1, 1902. This report will regale you with the gratifying fact that, as a business institution, the Conference is making most satisfactory progress, for the total funds of the Treasury have increased \$3,375 07; and our interest-bearing investments are now \$11,000, which, with the exception of \$1,000, earn six per cent. interest. These earning funds of the Conference brought our highest interest-return of \$431 25 during the past ten months which ought to be of surpassing interest to all the members.

Our receipts from all sources; dues, \$480 00; sale of books, \$3,746 74; and interest, \$431 25; amounted to \$4,657 99.

Our expenditures of all kinds, general expense, \$112 22; commissions, \$983 20; and ministers' aid \$187 50; amounted to \$1,282 92. Of the general increase of funds, \$1,649 90, is the increase of the Indigent Ministers' Fund which now amounts to \$6,587 75 and \$1,725 17; the increase of the General Fund whose total is now \$5,452 77. This shows our grand total of all funds to be \$12,040 52, with few liabilities, and seventy-seven members of the Conference owing dues to the sum of \$569 90. The golden shehels of the Conference are on the increase and should be a strong bond of union for all the members.

Bills for membership dues were sent out three times during the past ten months, but the responses thereto were not up to the standard, as will be seen from the number of delinquents in the membership item of this report. The following is in detail the tabulated statement of all transactions under the Treasurer's administration for the ten months ending May 1, 1902:

MEMBERSHIP.

July 1, 1901, Number of Paying Members Enrolled..	135
Elected Honorary Members.	2
Elected at the Conference	4
Re-instated and Dues remitted	3
Resigned during the year	2
Died during past year.	1
May 1, 1902, Total Number Paying Members	137
Honorary Members	6
Exempt from paying dues	3
Dues remitted up to 1901.	1
May 1, 1902, Total Membership of Conference	146
Amount of Dues collected from 86 members.	\$480 00
Amount of Dues outstanding 77 members	569 90
Members in good standing but owing \$5 00.	48
Members in good standing and clear on the books.	60
Members owing \$10 00 and more, liable to suspension	29

From this will be seen that only 60 members out of 137 paid their dues during the past year; that 118 members are in good standing, and that of the members not in good standing, 21 owe \$10 00, one \$12 50, one \$12 40, four \$15 00, one \$20 00 and one \$35 00:

RECEIPTS AND FUNDS ON HAND.

July 1, 1901, General Fund.....	\$3,727 60
Indigent Ministers' Fund	4,937 85
Balance in Bank.....	165 45
July 1, 1901—May 1, 1902—Dues.....	\$480 00
Feb. 15, 1902, 7½ months' Interest on \$7,500, at six per cent	281 25
May 6, 1902, 2½ months' Interest on \$10,- 000, at six per cent ..	125 00
10 months' Interest on \$1,000, at three per cent ..	25 00
	<hr/>
	\$901 25

From Publication Committee:

1902.

July 2, 1901.....	\$362 47
November 14, 1901	760 40
December 2, 1901.....	714 20
February 4, 1902	563 50
February 17, 1902	350 27
April 3, 1902	415 40
April 16, 1902	154 40
May 1, 1902	426 10
	<hr/>
	\$3,746 74
May 1, 1902, Total Receipts.....	4,657 99
July 1, 1901, Total Funds.....	8,665 45

DISBURSEMENTS.

Commissions to I. S. Moses, Agent.

1901.

Nov. 13.	\$34 51
13	72 49
13.	117 08
Dec. 3.	107 84

1902.

Feb. 1	102 70
April 15.	47 12
" 15.	53 08
" 17.	20 88

 \$555 70

PRAYER BOOK EXPENSES.

1901.

Nov. 13,	Brock & Rankin, for Binding and Paper	\$427 50
	Indigent Ministers' Account.	
July 1, 1901, to May 1, 1902,	Ministers' Allowance . . .	187 50
	General Expense:	

1901.

Sept. 12,	May & Kreidler, printing	\$18 01
Nov. 13,	C. S. Levi, stamps.	5 00
" 13,	L. Grossmann, expenses	5 36
" 13,	May & Kreidler, printing.	7 92
" 13,	L. Grossmann, stamps.	2 50
" 13,	Jos. Silverman, telegrams	10 00
" 13,	L. Grossmann, expressage.	2 27
" 13,	O. Klonower, janitor service	10 00
" 13,	F. Faville, telegrams	2 39

1902.

Feb. 1,	Philip Cowen, printing.	6 00
April 2,	A. Guttmacher, expenses	8 10

April 2, Wm. C. Popper & Co., printing and postage	\$8 50
" 15, C. S. Levi, printing, postage and telegrams	19 00
" 15, M. H. Harris, traveling expenses, postage	7 17
	<hr/>
	\$112 22

SUMMARY.

July 1, 1901, Total Funds	\$8,665 45
July 1, 1901, to May 1, 1902, Total Receipts	4,657 99
July 1, 1901, to May 1, 1902, Total Disbursements	1,282 92
May 1, 1902, Balance in Treasury	12,040 52

GENERAL FUND.

To this fund is credited one-half of all members' dues; one-half of net earnings from sale of books and one-half of interests of the invested funds of the Conference.

The general expenses of the Conference are paid out of this general fund.

RECEIPTS.

May 1, 1902, Members' dues	\$240 00
" 1, 1902, Profits from Book Sales	1,381 77
Feb. 15, 1902, Interest	215 62
	<hr/>
	\$1,837 39
July 1, 1901, Balance on hand	3,727 60

EXPENSES.

July 1, 1901, to May 1, 1902, General Expenses	\$112 22
Balance in Fund, May 1, 1902	5,452 77

INDIGENT MINISTERS' FUND.

To this fund is credited one-half of members' dues; one-half of the net earnings from sale of books and one-half of the interests of the invested funds of the Conference. Only allowances for indigent ministers are paid out of this fund.

RECEIPTS.

May 1, 1902, Members' Dues	\$240 00
" 1, 1902, Profits of Book Sales	1,381 77
" 1, 1902, Interest of Investments.....	215 63
	<hr/>
	\$1,837 40
July 1, 1901, Balance of Fund	4,937 85

EXPENSES.

July 1, 1901, to May 1, 1902, Ministers' Allowance	187 50
	<hr/>
Balance of Fund, May 1, 1902.....	\$6,587 75
Total of General and Ministers' Funds.....	12,040 52

INVESTMENT OF ASSETS.

June 26, 1901, Certificate of Deposit,	
at 3%.....	\$1,000 00
July 1, 1901, Bills receivable at 6% ...	7,500 00
Feb. 15, 1902, Bills receivable at 6% ..	2,500 00
May 1, 1902, German-American Nat.	
Bank	1,040 52
	<hr/>
	\$12,040 52

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

Total Funds, July 1, 1901	\$8,665 45
Total Funds, May 1, 1902	12,040 52
Total Increase in ten months....	3,375 07

Such an increase is unprecedented in the history of the Conference.

In connection with this report I submit also all books, vouchers, receipts and papers held in trust for the Conference. To the best of my ability the sacred trust confided to me has been discharged. I deeply regret that, owing to ill health, I was denied the pleasure of meeting and greeting my brethren in person.

Hoping that this accounting of the Treasurer will prove satisfactory, and thanking the Conference for the honor shown me, I am, with best wishes for the continued financial prosperity of our Institution.

Yours respectfully,

CHAS. S. LEVI,
Treasurer.

AUDITOR'S REPORT ON TREASURER'S ACCOUNT.

Statement to May 1, 1902.	Page.	Profit and Loss Acct.		Indigent Fund.	General Fund.				
		Expendi- tures.	Receipts.						
Dues.....	33		\$480 00	\$240 00	\$240 00				
Interest.....	77		431 25	215 02	215 02				
Book and Printing acct.....	53	\$985 26	3,746 74	1,381 77	1,381 77				
Indigent Ministers Ex.....	63	187 50	\$187 50						
General Expense.....	43	112 22		\$112 22					
Net Increase—Profit.....		3,375 07		1,725 17					
Ministers Indigent Fund.....						\$4,037 35			
July 1, 1901.....						1,640 90			
Ministers Indigent Fund.....									
Ministers Indigent Fund.....							\$6,587 75		
Total May 1, 1902.....						3,727 60			
General Fund, July 1, 1901.....						1,725 17			
“ “ Increase.....									
1,102 58.....							5,452 77		
Total of all Funds.....							\$12,040 52		
German-Amer. Nat. Bk.....								\$1,040 52	
Certificate of Deposit.....								1,000 00	
Bills Receivable.....								10,000 00	
									\$12,040 52
		\$1,057 00	\$4,657 00	\$1,837 40	\$1,837 30	\$12,040 52	\$12,040 52		\$12,040 52

O. K., W. B. WOOLSEY, Auditor.

Recess was taken at 12.30 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Conference reassembled at 2 P. M., and resumed discussion on the Sabbath Question.

M. Heller read I. Lewinthal's paper.

The following spoke on the question :

G. Deutsch, I. S. Moses, H. G. Enelow, S. H. Sonneschein, M. Heller, L. Wolsey, S. Sale, M. P. Jacobson, J. Friedlander, A. Guttmacher, T. Schanfarber, M. Sessler, J. Krauskopf. (See Appendix.)

The Conference adjourned at 4 o'clock to visit the local Jewish charitable institutions, The Touro Infirmary, Old Folks' Home and Orphan Asylum.

THURSDAY, MAY 8TH.

The session was opened with prayer by L. Wolsey.

The following resolution was received and upon motion was amended so as to be referred to the Executive Committee :

Resolved. That a committee on Religious Schools be appointed to draw up a resolution of practical recommendations for the Improvement of Religious Instruction, to be submitted to congregations. This committee to report to the next convention.

The following report of Committee on Auditing report of Committee on Hymnal was presented and adopted:

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO AUDIT UNION HYMNAL
ACCOUNTS.**

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your committee appointed to audit the report of the Committee on Union Hymnal, begs leave to report: That it is gratified to learn of the increased interest shown in the use of the Union Hymnal in the Sabbath Schools and Congregations of this country, and that the deficit which last year was shown in its accounts has been fully met and that now it has a surplus to its credit. It finds the financial statement of the committee correct in all its details. It recommends that a vote of thanks be tendered Alois Kaiser, the Chairman of the Committee, who has given his time and energy in the distribution of the Hymnal and recommends that Mr. Kaiser be again appointed as Chairman of the Hymnal Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

T. SCHANFARBER, *Chairman.*

D. MARX,

EDW. S. LEVY.

REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE ON TREASURER'S REPORT.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your committee to whom has been referred the Treasurer's report of his accounts from July 1, 1901, to May 1, 1902, begs leave to report that they have examined the said report and its accompanying vouchers and securities and find the same correct.

Although we have the utmost confidence in the security of the investments made by the Treasurer and deem the same gilt-edged, we beg to recommend that hereafter the funds of the Conference shall be invested in mortgages or bonds and not in promissory notes.

Your committee is of the opinion that your Treasurer deserves the thanks of the Conference for the faithful manner in which he has discharged the responsible and arduous duties of his office.

Respectfully submitted,

I. L. LEUCHT,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

JOSEPH FRIEDLANDER.

BALTIMORE, May 2, 1902.

The report was adopted and the recommendation as to investment referred to the Executive Committee with power.

The following committees were appointed: On Religious Schools, H. H. Mayer, H. G. Enelow, W. Willner, M. P. Jacobson. On Resolutions: M. Heller, T. Schanfarber, I. S. Moses, G. Deutsch, J. Krauskopf. On Thanks: M. P. Jacobson, J. S. Raisin, S. G. Bottigheimer, J. Herz. On Nominations: I. L. Leucht, G. Deutsch, H. Cohen, M. Messing, E. S. Levy.

The following telegram of acknowledgment was received from the Western Unitarian Conference and ordered filed:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 7th, 1902.

The Western Unitarian Conference at its Fiftieth Anniversary acknowledges the message from the Central Association of American Rabbis in New Orleans, and conveys to that association its most cordial and fraternal greetings.

F. C. SOUTHWORTH, *Secretary*.

President Alderman of Tulane University made a brief address, which was well received by the Conference.

The Committee on President's Message made the following preliminary report: "Your committee recommends the suggestion of the President that three additional members be added to the Executive Committee and that the necessary article of the Constitution be accordingly amended. J. Voorsanger, I. L. Leucht, G. Deutsch, M. Messing, H. Cohen." Unanimously adopted.

A report on the Wise Memorial Fund was read as follows:

THE MEMORIAL FUND.

A REPORT FROM MR. JULIUS WEIS TO THE CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

GENTLEMEN:—As you no doubt are aware, about twelve months since, I was appointed a member of the National Committee of the Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund, to solicit subscriptions, and I selected as my territory the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Florida and Texas.

At the time, I expected that I would be able to raise \$15,000 to \$20,000, but I have been disappointed in this respect.

The Rev. Max Heller kindly offered his services to me, and, after due consideration, we concluded to issue a pamphlet, in which Dr. Heller set forth the history of the Hebrew Union College from the date of its foundation. The *Ledger* and *Chronicle* also assisted me in the way of editorials. I had about 4,000 copies of this pamphlet printed, and mailed them, together with a circular letter, to the president of each congregation, about seventy in number, outside of New Orleans, and also to every Israelite whose name I found in Dun's Mercantile Agency book in the six states above mentioned. I have no doubt that some of you gentlemen have seen this pamphlet and letter.

Up to this time I have only succeeded in raising about \$5,000, of which about \$3,000 has been collected from twelve congregations,

as you will see from the subscription lists. The balance has been contributed by individuals in this city and throughout the six states, as a result of my letters and circulars.

Recently, I have again mailed circular letters to localities where there are no congregations, and to parties who had not responded to my previous appeals.

I therefore concluded to lay these facts before you and to ask your kind assistance. You will see from the subscription lists that my friend, Rev. Max Heller, has virtually done more in the way of collections than myself, he having collected \$2,700 before I was appointed on the National Committee and subsequently, as a result of his visits to four different places, he has raised an additional \$2,000.

Rev. Mr. Jacobson, of Shreveport, La., also offered his services and visited Alexandria, La., where there is a small congregation, which resulted in the collection of \$200.

Rev. Mr. Solomon, of Vicksburg, collected from his congregation and in Port Gibson, \$1,000.

I would now request that you form yourselves into committees for each State and exchange pulpits, which I feel certain will bring forth good results, judging from the success which has attended the efforts of the Rev. Messrs. Heller, Jacobson and Solomon.

You will see from the lists that the twelve congregations which have responded comprise a membership of 650, and the total amount subscribed has been \$3,000, or an average of \$5 per member. The fifty-two congregations not yet heard from comprise about 2,500 members, and should likewise average \$5 per member, which would give us \$10,000 additional.

I know of no good reason why we should not be able to raise from \$15,000 to \$20,000 as I have hoped to do.

It is, of course, needless for me to impress upon you the importance of raising the half million dollars required, not only to perpetuate the Hebrew Union College, but likewise to honor the memory of the late Dr. Wise. I therefore hope you will approve of my suggestion and organize at once so as to get to work upon your return home.

I hope you will pardon me for having trespassed upon your

valuable time, and in conclusion, I wish to state that my friend, Rev. Max Heller, is entitled to more credit than I for what has already been accomplished, as the \$2,700 collected by him previous to my appointment on the National Committee and amounts subsequently collected aggregate over \$4,000.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE ISAAC M. WISE MEMORIAL FUND DURING THE
PAST TWELVE MONTHS.

Collected by Rev. Max Heller previous to my appointment on the National Committee, from a few members of Temple Sinai in this city, and remitted by him direct..... \$2,700 00

COLLECTIONS SINCE MY APPOINTMENT.

From Congregation at—

Monroe, La., by Dr. Heller.	\$ 224 00
Shreveport, La., " "	1,090 50
Baton Rouge, La., by Dr. Heller.	196 00
Port Gibson, by Dr. Solomon..	375 00
Vicksburg, " " "	670 00
San Antonio, Tex.....	205 00
Alexandria, La.....	145 00
Brookhaven, Miss.....	196 00
Woodville, Miss.	37 00
Columbus, Miss.....	111 50
Greenville, Tex.....	38 00
Natchez, Miss., contributed as a result of the visit of Dr. Heller and myself, and now in course of collection	565 00
Greenville, Miss., by Rabbi Brill.....	650 00

Amounts contributed by individuals in New Orleans and
throughout the six States apportioned to me, about 2,000 00

Total..... \$9,213 00

Respectfully yours,

JULIUS WEIS.

The paper on "The Bible and Modern Thought" was then read by Rabbi S. Sale and discussed by various speakers. (See Appendix.)

Rabbi D. Marx announced that his committee had placed the wreath upon the grave of the late Rabbi J. K. Gutheim.

The Sabbath Question was again discussed. (See Appendix.)

FRIDAY, MAY 9TH.

The session was opened with prayer by E. S. Levy.

Rabbi Leucht presented a silver mounted gavel on behalf of Leonard Krower, president of Touro Synagogue. Rabbi Hirsch Werner presented three Leeser Bibles to the Conference.

The President received both gifts on behalf of the Conference with appropriate words of thanks.

The report on The Non-Affiliated was read by Jos. Krauskopf.

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON "THE NON-AFFILIATED
WITH CONGREGATIONS."**

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN:—Your Committee on "The Non-affiliated with Congregations" submitted a report at the Conference, held in Philadelphia, last year, which met with your approval. This report appears on page 73 of the 1901 Year Book. In accordance with the expressions of sentiments voiced therein, a movement has been started among many of our Congregations tending toward the solution of the problem of "the Non-affiliated." The impetus given this movement by the Conference at its last meeting has been of sufficient encouragement to warrant calling the attention of our members, a second time to this important element in congregational development.

In March of the present year, a circular letter, containing a copy of the Resolutions of the Conference, and requesting an expression of opinion and experience in the matters referred to in the Resolutions, was addressed to the various congregations by the President of the Conference. The responses to this circular letter emphasize more than ever the importance of this problem, and the need of continued agitation in the direction already begun.

The Congregation Shaarai Shomayim, of Mobile, Alabama, writes through its president, S. Haas:

"We are entirely in accord with the spirit and object of the resolutions passed by the Conference of American Rabbis. I suppose the only effective means to improve the evil, is the *active and personal solicitation*, on the part of officers and Rabbis among those, in their sphere of duty, who can be properly approached. In this city we are troubled only by the indifference of young and elder *unmarried* men, among whom we are doing our best, and indeed have quite a number on our list—families there are but *two* (rather recent arrivals) not affiliated with us—always excepting the Russian and Rumanian Colonies who are a crowd unto themselves."

Congregation B'nai Israel, of Columbus, Ohio, through its president, S. D. Burgunder, writes:

"For many years, we have experienced the same difficulty as you set forth in your communication, the question of the non-affiliated with the congregation, and I heartily endorse the sentiments that since the congregations are organized for the purpose of all members of their creed, that the maintenance of the same should rest upon the entire community in which such congregations exist. We likewise feel the heavy tax which is dependant upon the few, because of the refusal of so many who are not affiliated with the congregation, to share in the expense of up-holding such congregation, but who, however, desire all courtesies extended them, when the hour of need strikes them, and in all such cases, and especially in our community here, where the matter lies entirely in my hands, and where all such cases are referred to me of the non-affiliated, asking for privileges in the hour of need, it makes it very unpleasant for me, because in many cases it is not

looked upon as a matter of duty on my part to act, but rather as a personal matter, and yet, I feel, that while in the hour of trouble, I should not be too exacting. However, we must further consider that on the other hand these very people did not desire to be affiliated with us, and simply regarded the matter of little importance, only in the hour of need thinking that at such times all that is necessary would be to make the requisite application, and everything would be granted. * * *

The Resolution requesting Congregations to present this matter to the notice of all non-affiliated in their respective communities has been a matter (to) which I have given earnest attention. * * * I was instrumental in bring (ing) to pass a resolution, sending a further appeal to all those in our community who are not already affiliated with our congregation, setting forth the fact, taken from your communication, 'that none are so poor that they cannot help to strengthen and up-hold the congregation.' * * * The renting of seats for the holiday services has (not) been done in our congregation for the last five years or more * * * those too poor to become members of the Congregation, were simply given seats free of charge, compelling the others to become members. This also had a very good effect. * * * We admit all children to the Sabbath School, because we feel that children should be instructed, even though the parents do not feel sufficiently interested in upholding such an institution. * * *

I should certainly be pleased to see the Conference adopt some measures whereby it would be universal, that all congregations should refuse the services of the Rabbi, both at marriage and funeral ceremonies, to all non-affiliated members in their community. I would further suggest for the Conference to adopt a measure whereby all applications made by residents of one city, for the services of the Rabbi from another city, either for marriage or funeral ceremonies, be refused by said Rabbi, until they first inquire from the Congregation or its presiding officer, in the city from which said application comes, why the applicant does not receive the services of the Rabbi of the community in which the applicant lives. * * * In many instances where the parties are not affiliated with the Congregation (in the town) in which

they live, they boast that if they cannot get the services of the Rabbi of the Congregation, when they require it, all that is necessary for them to do, is to notify the Rabbi from a neighboring city to officiate, and the expense thereto would be less than becoming members of the congregation. This has been a great obstacle in many instances, and for this reason I make this suggestion, and if it meets with your approval, I would be pleased to have it presented at the next Conference."

The Congregation K. K. B. I., of Charleston, W. Va., are of opinion that:

"A good way to induce the non-affiliated to become members of Jewish Congregations is that the Rabbis should not officiate at funerals, marriages or any other ceremonies in which his services are required, unless they are members of a congregation. We have also found that barring persons from our Social Club, providing they are not members of our congregation, is a good way to in a manner bring them to terms. * * * We can speak from our experience on this point and have found it quite successful here."

Julius Weis, President of Temple Sinai Congregation, of New Orleans, says:

"I am fully in accord with the ideas set forth therein and, in fact, our congregation has already recognized the existence of these facts, and are now attempting to remedy them as best we can."

The Board of Trustees, of Temple Beth-El, Detroit, Mich., have by unanimous vote endorsed the resolutions, and send us word that they stand ready to co-operate with us in all heartiness.

"It is a matter," their letter says, "which should have the ardent support of every congregation and of every rabbi. We congratulate the Conference upon the stand you have taken in the matter, and we trust that every congregation will find it possible to endorse not only in spirit, but in fact, your resolutions. As for ourselves, we are ready to follow your leading, and in appreciation of the great good, spiritual as well as material, that must accrue to congregations from actions such as these taken by the Conference, we deem it our duty as well as our privilege to send our

rabbi to your session, not only in his own behalf, but as *our* delegate, to voice these sentiments."

The Board of the Mount Zion Hebrew Congregation, of St. Paul, Minnesota, writes that it is "in hearty sympathy with the tenor of the resolutions adopted by the Conference, and will act in conformity therewith so far as possible."

The Board of Temple Emanu-El Congregation, of New York, says:

"Will do all in its power to assist in carrying out the objects of the Conference as stated in your communication."

The Bene Israel Congregation of Cincinnati, O., is "in entire sympathy with the expressions of the Conference on the subject."

Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, of Newark, N. J., says the resolutions "meet with their hearty approval."

Beth Israel, of Macon, Ga.: "by unanimous vote (we) fully endorse resolutions."

Temple Rodeph Sholom, of New York City, "is in accord with the sentiments expressed in the circular."

The Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D. C., "are in hearty sympathy with the views expressed."

The North Chicago Hebrew Congregation, of Chicago, is "in full accord."

PHILADELPHIA, May 2, 1902.

REV. DR. MAURICE H. HARRIS,

Corresponding Secretary Central Conference American Rabbis.

DEAR SIR:—Congregation Rodeph Shalom is in hearty sympathy with the sentiment of the resolutions; in fact, for a great many years our congregation has been laboring, with a considerable degree of success, to bring about the result sought by the Conference.

We do not rent seats for holidays only. We take a firm stand upon this and insist that seats shall be rented for the full year, with the result that there is not a single person upon the rolls to-day who is not regularly affiliated with the congregation.

We also have a by-law as follows: The President shall "issue

a permit to applicants desiring the services of the Rabbi or of the Reader at marriages or funerals, for which individuals not members or seat renters shall pay not less than Ten Dollars." When such a person applies for a permit we urge him to take seats for the Ten Dollars, or as much more as he may desire to give. Our lowest priced seats are Five Dollars each, and thus the man who is only willing to spend Ten Dollars is given two seats and becomes a member of the congregation for one year; though, of course, any one unable to pay is cheerfully accorded all privileges.

The result of this measure has been that quite a number of people have been induced to become and have remained members of the congregation, who before were loath to do so.

Rodeph Shalom Congregation will be glad to co-operate in any way to bring about the desired end.

Yours very truly,

ISAAC HASSLER,
Secretary.

The Hebrew Congregation, of Akron, Ohio, writes: "the resolutions meet with the hearty approval of this congregation," as does also Congregation Adath Israel, of Madison, Indiana; but both of these latter congregations admit that the evil intended to be prevented does not exist in their communities, inasmuch as at Akron, all the Jewish inhabitants belong to either one or the other of the two congregations there, and in Madison there is but one congregation, with which "all are affiliated."

The Beth Israel, of Macon, The North Chicago Hebrew Congregation, and the Washington Hebrew Congregation express a desire to co-operate in the work by distributing cards and slips and copies of the resolutions.

Perhaps the most systematic effort toward accomplishing the affiliation of the entire community in congregational activities has been made in the City of Philadelphia. In the Fall of 1901 the following uptown rabbis formed themselves into the "Philadelphia Rabbinical Association," composed of Henry Berkowitz, Bernhard C. Ehrenreich, Leon H. Elmaleh, Julius H. Greenstone, M. M. Eichler, Secretary, and Jos. Krauskopf, Chairman, being

the rabbis of the five larger Jewish congregations in the city. One of the objects of the Association was the solution of the problem of the "failure of hundreds of confessing Jews to affiliate with and support the congregations." A lengthy circular, or manifesto, was prepared, pointing out the seriousness of the problem, the great benefits bestowed by the synagogues upon the entire community of Jews, the fact that those deriving benefits were not contributing toward the support of the synagogues, though eager to accept its benefits, that as a result the progress of the congregations was retarded, their energy being wasted in large part in eking out an existence, instead of spreading good, concluding with an appeal to recognize the claims of the Jewish religion upon the entire Jewish community. (A copy of the circular in full is attached to the report.) The Philadelphia Rabbinical Association then selected from the best obtainable list of Jewish families the names of all those not directly affiliated with one or another of the Congregations of the city and sent the circular (of which the above is a paraphrase), to every one of the names so selected.

A material increase in membership in each of the uptown Jewish Congregations, in Philadelphia, ensued upon the issuance of this manifesto, and while it is not possible to say in exact figures how much of the increase was the result of these circulars, it is a fair presumption that very much credit should be given to this method of agitation.

The next step taken by the Rabbinical Association, of Philadelphia, was a movement looking to a Federation of the uptown Jewish Congregations, of Philadelphia, for the purpose of better attaining the common ends sought in the Manifesto issued by the rabbis. A call was extended to the President of each congregation asking that delegates be sent to a meeting in which the strengthening and up-building of the Jewish Congregations and the widening of their work shall be discussed. The meeting resulted in a committee being appointed for the purpose of drafting a plan of organization. After several meetings, a plan of operation was unanimously adopted, and the same referred to each congregation for ratification. Inasmuch as three of the

five congregations have thus far given their consent to join the organization, the Federation of the uptown Jewish Congregations, of Philadelphia, is effected, and will soon commence its operations, under the following plan of organization:

PLAN OF ORGANIZATION.

FEDERATION OF JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF PHILADELPHIA.

(U. J. C. P.)

PREAMBLE.

Impelled by the conviction that the cause of Judaism in the city of Philadelphia, may be promoted by united effort on the part of the congregations, we, the Congregations Adath Jeshurun, Beth Israel, Keneseth Israel, Mickve Israel and Rodeph Shalom, do herewith form ourselves into an organization to be known as the UNION OF JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF PHILADELPHIA.

OBJECTS.

- I. The object of this Federation shall be:
 - (a) To foster a spirit of fraternity and thus strengthen the sentiment of devotion to our common cause among all its members.
 - (b) To engage in united effort for advancing the interests of Judaism in our city.
- II. The means by which these Objects shall be attained to be:
 - (a) By creating a Bureau of Information for the compilation of data respecting Israelites in the city; their numbers, their congregational affiliation or lack of such, the provisions for religious education and the expansion of same to meet the growing needs of the community; and also as to the growth of population, immigration, marriages, burials, charities, etc.

- (b) By making active propaganda among Jews—unitedly and without interfering with the autonomy of any of the constituent congregations in order to increase the membership of existing Jewish congregations.
- (c) By making like propaganda to secure the attendance of every Jewish child at some Jewish Religious School.
- (d) By stimulating and aiding the organization of congregations and religious schools for Israelites, where the same do not exist and where they may, from time to time, be needed with a view to directing and unifying these agencies for advancing the Jewish cause in our midst.
- (e) By furthering the religious and educational needs of the Jews in public institutions.
- (f) By acting as a representative organ for the Jewish congregations in all public undertakings or functions in which the interests of Judaism are to be served.
- (g) By all other means that may hereafter be devised for meeting the conditions as they arise in the development of the Jewish communal life of Philadelphia.

MEMBERSHIP.

- I. Each congregation in this Federation shall be entitled to a representation of six delegates, clerical and lay, selected by the congregation in such way as it may determine.
 - (a) These delegates shall constitute the Executive Council of the Federation, with full power to elect officers, transact business and enact all laws necessary for the government of that body.
- II. Other congregations than those named in the Preamble may, from time to time, be admitted by a majority vote of the members of the Executive Council present at any meeting.

OFFICERS.

- I. The officers shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Treasurer and a Recording Secretary, who shall be elected by ballot and shall hold office one year or until their successors are chosen.

- II. All these officers shall be honorary, and shall fulfill the duties usually incumbent upon the same.
- III. A clerk shall be elected by the Executive Council for such term and at such remuneration as that body may determine.

The duties of this clerk shall be prescribed by the Executive Council and shall be faithfully executed under the immediate direction of the President of the Union.

MEETINGS OF THE UNION.

- I. The Executive Council shall meet bi-monthly and special meetings may be held at the call of the President.
- II. An Annual Meeting of all the members of all constituent congregations of the Federation shall take place for the formal inauguration of the officers, hearing their reports, etc.

FUNDS.

The money needed for the work of this Union shall be secured by subscription or contribution from individual members or others and by an equitable contribution requested from each of the constituent congregations.

ORGANIZATION.

This Union shall be considered dissolved if, at any time, less than three congregations remain affiliated with it.

AMENDMENTS.

This constitution may be amended at any regular meeting of the Executive Council, by three-fifths of those in attendance, provided the amendment has been proposed at the previous meeting.

THE MANIFESTO, ISSUED BY THE RABBINICAL ASSOCIATION OF
PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA, September 1, 1901.

To our Fellow-Israelites of Philadelphia:

At a meeting held this day by the undersigned Rabbis of Philadelphia, earnest consideration was given to serious problems confronting the ministers and their congregations.

A unanimous consensus of opinion was reached to the effect that the most serious problem of all, and that from which the others mainly arise, is the failure of hundreds of confessing Jews to affiliate with and support the congregations.

This is true, despite their sharing directly or indirectly in the benefits which the synagogue bestows.

The synagogue stands as the accredited representative and champion of each and every Jew. It conserves his highest interests; it pleads his cause, defends his name, and instructs the public at large on what the Jew is, what he is not, how he is misunderstood, and how he has been and still is wronged. It is almost wholly due to the pulpit, and the forces it has created, that the Jew is to-day in America better understood, more appreciated, freer from prejudice and ostracism than ever before.

You, the reader hereof, though unaffiliated (if we are correctly informed), derive the immediate benefit of all this equally with those who are supporters of the congregations. Yet you are permitting the few to bear the burden of upholding these most important institutions. True, there are not many that fail to answer the call of charity. Let it then be remembered that all our charitable and educational societies owe their origin and inspiration to the congregations and their teachings.

The failure to appreciate all this renders the present status of all our congregations most deplorable.

Despite the most stinted management, the officers are confronted by annual deficits, the burden of mortgages, payment of interest, etc., so that the greater work of religion and humanity, for which we stand, is left undone. Thus the influence which the Jew

could exercise, and the fuller appreciation he might merit, is sadly curtailed.

By their conduct, many question the necessity of the existence of congregations, yet it is patent to every one that these serve every Israelite for the education of himself and his children. At every crisis in life they minister to the individual and his home, be it in joy or sorrow, and there is no one who does not unhesitatingly make use of these benefits, when need requires, even though doing nothing to support the congregations.

These benefits it would be impossible for the synagogue to render if the few faithful and over-taxed ones were to act in a like blame-worthy manner.

The strength of other denominations around us is largely due to the fact that even the poorest individuals, down to the humblest servant girls or the day laborers, regard it as a most sacred obligation to contribute their share to the upholding of the church, while it is well known that many among us, who can well afford to do so, and who do not stint themselves otherwise, refuse to uphold the synagogue.

It is the duty of every Jew in this city to belong to a congregation. No matter how little financial support he can give, his gift will be as welcome as that of the richest.

One of the most serious evils we face is the fact that the membership of parents or other relatives is often taken to include not only the children, but also other adult members of the family; and even after the marriage of these adults, the synagogue is continued to be used by them without any other support than that given by the parents. Very many even defer joining the synagogue until their children are old enough to be sent to the Sabbath School.

As rabbis and responsible heads of the local Jewish Congregations, we feel it our sacred duty to arouse the public conscience to a clear recognition of these facts, and to urge upon you and upon all those who may have, through thoughtlessness or other cause, hitherto neglected this duty, to recognize your obligation and at once become a member of some Jewish congregation of this city, selecting the one which best represents your religious and other convictions.

Trusting that the imperative necessity of the claims of our religion will appeal to you and prompt you to a speedy action in this matter, we have the honor to be

Yours very sincerely,

PHILADELPHIA RABBINICAL ASSOCIATION,
JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF, *Chairman*,
122 W. Manheim Street,
Germantown.

HENRY BERKOWITZ,
1539 N. 33d Street.

BERNHARD C. EHRENREICH,
1337 N. 7th Street.

LEON H. ELMALEH,
117 N. 7th Street.

JULIUS H. GREENSTONE,
934½ N. 6th Street.

M. M. EICHLER, *Secretary*,
1931 N. 8th Street,

To whom all communications should be addressed.

Your committee therefore urge that the work in this line be continued; that Federations be effected in every city of two or more Jewish congregations; that copies of this report be sent to the Presidents of all the Jewish Congregations in the United States; that the rabbis speak from their pulpits from time to time urging those not affiliated to join; that the Jewish press be utilized to reach many who are otherwise not within the reach of the pulpit. Every legitimate avenue of suasion should be entered with a view to making the Jewish community and the Jewish congregations synonymous terms.

Respectfully submitted in behalf of Committee on the Non-Affiliated, by

JOS. KRAUSKOPF, *Chairman*.

After considerable discussion it was agreed that the Committee on Non-Affiliated be continued at the discretion of the Executive Committee.

The report of the Committee on President's Message was received and adopted.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

BRETHREN:—Your Committee to whom has been referred the President's message, begs leave to report that they have concluded their deliberations and report as follows:

Your Committee desires to offer a sentiment of congratulation to the President of the Conference for the able, zealous, intelligent manner in which he has discharged his duties, and has brought to the attention of the ministry the issues of the times, which require treatment as well as grave and anxious deliberation. The Conference, no doubt, thoroughly appreciates the wise and able direction of so capable an officer, and desires to record its gratitude for the wise suggestions the President has been pleased to submit to its consideration.

NO. 1.—ZIONISM.

Your Committee begs to endorse the emphatic expression of the President on this subject, and refers this Conference to the declaration made by the Montreal Conference of 1897.

NO. 2.—SEMITIC STUDIES.

Your Committee approves of the President's suggestion that the American Rabbinate assist in the introduction and development of Semitic studies in the Universities of the United States. This, undoubtedly, is one of the generous means by which the community life of Israel in this country can be brought in close touch with the intellectual life of the people at large, and this also is one of the processes by which the Jewish communities can become great factors in promoting a scientific study of its great literature by aid of which mutual appreciation, tolerance, and a recognition of the

true status of the people of Israel must needs be promoted. Your Committee, therefore, recommends that every Jewish minister should make it his particular duty to identify himself with the university located in or near his place of residence, and that he should stimulate his own people to become warm supporters of, as well as generous contributors to, the establishment of Semitic chairs.

NO. 3.—ALLIANCE ISRAELITE UNIVERSELLE.

Your Committee endorses the President's approbation of the work of this most excellent institution which, in its half century career, has conferred so many blessings upon a large number of Oriental communities, and has aroused the spirit of activity and fraternity in our Western land.

Your Committee is of the opinion that the mission of the Alliance Israelite Universelle is a permanent one; that its functions as the great educator of thousands of people cannot be surrendered to any organization that may seek to usurp it, and that, as heretofore, the great Paris society represents a centrifugal force which radiates throughout the avenues along which the people of Israel are located.

Your Committee recommends to the Rabbinate not to neglect to urge upon the people a hearty and generous support of this organization, and, with that object in view, introduces the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Sabbath before Purim be set aside by the Rabbinate for the special purpose of presenting to their congregations the needs as well as the mission of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, and that a collection be instituted on that day to promote the work of this association.

NO. 4.—JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Your Committee, in interpretation of the President's remarks, hails with satisfaction the resumption of operations on this great literary work of our century, and appeals to this Conference to

exercise its influence on its behalf, so that the work may have a more liberal support than it has hitherto enjoyed. The Jewish Encyclopedia is not only an important contribution to literature, but the degree of its work is such that it has been hailed in every part of the world as an important factor to place the people of Israel in its true position as one of the liberal educators of mankind, and as one of the important contributors to the civilization of all times.

Your Committee believes that the Rabbinate can and should do much toward bringing to the attention of their people the need of supporting this great enterprise, recognized as a purely experimental work by a firm of Christian publishers, who were imbued with the conviction that such a work should be presented to the world. In view of the vast benefits that must accrue to our people from the completion and publication of this work, it is only fair and just that the members of our religious fraternity possessed of means should place this work on their shelves, thereby not alone assisting the financial enterprise as they ought, but will secure for themselves and their children an element of education which needs must result in the greater development of the Jewish spirit and, hence, in the larger outreaching of our community life.

NO. 5.—AMERICAN JEWS IN RUSSIA.

Your Committee heartily approves of the utterances of the President in this important matter, and hails with satisfaction the work inaugurated by Judge Goldfogle in pressing upon the Russian government the rights of American Jews as being in no wise distinct from those of any other classes of the citizenship of the United States. Your Committee, therefore, recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That a committee of three from the members of this Conference be appointed to draw up resolutions incorporating the approval of the work of the Conference with the work of Judge Goldfogle, and that the officers of the Conference be instructed to forward these resolutions to Judge Goldfogle.

No. 6.—REFORM AND ORTHODOXY.

Your Committee approves of the sentiments uttered by the President touching upon the present, mutual, friendly attitude between the two great wings of our people.

Your Committee cannot sufficiently urge upon the Conference the necessity of promoting friendship and fraternity between the elements of their communities represented in these two great factions—for we must never forget that whilst we may differ in some essentials, we do not differ in the principles of our faith, nor in the necessity of maintaining the great historical mission of the people of Israel, nor in uniting in all sweet and tender influences which have graced our community life and make our congregations and associations such strong factors in the present social environments in which they exist.

Reform and Orthodoxy are, after all, but names that represent opposing tendencies and not opposing truths, and we may truly say and urge this fact as the line of action to be always followed by the American Rabbinate, remembering אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים. אף על פי שאלו מטמאין ואלו מטהרין בלה בתבו מרחק אחד:

In this connection, your Committee would call attention to a resolution of the Cincinnati Convention of 1899, looking to the inauguration of a tract movement by which the principles, discipline and history of Reform Judaism should be brought to the attention of the people who constitute its adherents.

Your Committee regrets to say that this resolution was not carried out, but desires at this time to reiterate the importance of its introduction and hopes that the Conference will find a way to carrying it into practical effect.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the incoming Executive Committee be authorized to select from the members of the Conference a number of writers who shall, in the form of short and pithy statements, present to the membership of our Reform synagogues its aims and objects as heretofore described.

No. 7.—WELCOME TO PROFESSOR S. SCHECHTER.

Your Committee approves of the President's sentiments regarding the advent of this eminent scholar and Jewish teacher. The Central Conference of American Rabbis is always in line for broad scholarship and culture, and hails with the utmost satisfaction this important acquisition to our teaching force in the United States, and should record its conviction that, under Divine blessing, Prof. Schechter's work in the United States will become a powerful influence in developing all the factors necessary to place our religious life in this country upon even stronger and more enduring foundations.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary of this Conference be authorized to address a communication to Prof. S. Schechter, President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, assuring him of a hearty welcome and expressing admiration of his past achievements and its prayers for a successful career in the United States.

No. 8.—HEBREW UNION COLLEGE.

Your Committee is heartily in accord with every suggestion expressed by the President upon this important subject, this Conference recognizes that the Hebrew Union College is a national institution, demanding and deserving national support. This Conference stands committed to this enterprise by which the educational interests of our religion will be promoted and strengthened, and which demands the active, financial support of our brethren throughout the country.

The Isaac Wise Memorial Fund is a foundation that does not merely honor the great memory of the pioneer President, but is in line with the activities which, from time to time, must develop, in order to make the Hebrew Union College the great institution it ought to be.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends, first, that the members of this Conference urge upon their respective congregations

the necessity of enrolling themselves into the Union of American Congregations. Secondly, that the affluent members be interviewed and urged to do their share toward the Wise Memorial Fund and enable the Hebrew Union College, in due course of time, to accomplish the great mission mapped out by its founders. Thirdly, that this Conference expresses active sympathy with the Isaac Wise Memorial Fund by a contribution of Two Thousand Dollars, which is herewith unanimously recommended.

And with a further view of permanently securing the interests of the Hebrew Union College, your Committee recommends the following:

That the members of this Conference address their congregations on Shabuoth on behalf of the College and that, the officers of the congregations concurring, a collection on that day may be instituted.

NO. 9.—QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Your Committee cannot agree with the President in the advisability of founding a Quarterly Review for this Conference. Several magazines and quarterly reviews of high excellence are accessible to every member of the Conference; in view whereof, in the judgment of your Committee, the foundation of another similar publication is at the present time inadvisable, this Conference not having any means at hand to insure a successful operation of such a publication.

NO. 10.—MANUALS AND CATECHISMS.

Your Committee cordially approves of the President's recommendation with regard to the composition of various manuals which will be great helps to the ministry in the practical discharge of their duties.

Uniformity in the service-texts for weddings and funerals and other public functions, as well as rituals for various home services, is, in the opinion of your Committee, greatly needed, and your Committee, therefore, recommends the appointment of a special committee of five to whom shall be committed the duty of distributing the work among such members of the Conference who, in

their judgment, are especially fit for such work, with instruction to submit the results of their labor to the next annual Conference.

AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTIONS.

"A."—Your Committee recommends that the President's recommendation, looking to the amendment to Article "VI," Section I, of the Constitution, providing for an honorary President of the Conference, be concurred in.

"B."—That the President's recommendation, amending the Constitution, looking to an addition of three members to the Executive Committee of the Conference be approved.

"C."—That the President's suggestion, referring to the time of the annual meeting be concurred in.

IN MEMORIAM.

Your Committee recommends the appointment of a special committee of five, to draw up suitable resolutions regarding the loss this Conference has sustained in the demise of our lamented and and well-beloved brother, Rabbi Adolph Moses. (See Appendix.)

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

Your Committee approves of the recommendations of the President in this important matter, and calls attention to the discussions upon the subject in the course of the present session of the Conference, and the four associated members of this Committee recommend that the paper written by Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger be made the basis of the deliberations of that commission.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RABBI AND CONGREGATION.

Together with the President, this Committee regrets that the Commission, to whom this important subject was entrusted, has not made any report and asks for the appointment of a new Committee to whom this question shall be committed for consideration.

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY OF CONFERENCE.

Your Committee approves of the President's recommendations in this respect, and recommends the appointment of a special committee of five to report upon this matter at the next Conference.

INDEPENDENT RECOMMENDATIONS.

Your Committee regrets that while the business of the Conference is increasing from year to year, the work assigned by former conventions to various committees has not been finished and your Committee urges that the incoming Executive Board be instructed to see to it that the committees appointed on the various questions by former conventions finish their labors. Your Committee found itself very greatly hampered in its work by the fact that the former Year Books were not at its disposal. Your Committee therefore begs to recommend that the issues of the book which are exhausted be reprinted and that a carefully prepared index covering eleven volumes thus far published and the proceedings of this convention be published in an edition large enough to allow its use by every member attending future conventions.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOB VOORSANGER, *Chairman.*
G. DEUTSCH,
I. L. LEUCHT,
M. MESSING,
HY. COHEN.

It was moved by I. S. Moses and seconded by M. Heller that the Conference conveys congratulations and welcome to Dr. Solomon Schechter on the occasion of the reception to be tendered to him by the Directors of the Theological Seminary, Saturday, May 10th. The Secretary was instructed to telegraph same.

The place for the next meeting of the Conference was then discussed, J. Voorsanger inviting the Conference to San Francisco, and L. M. Franklin, to Detroit. The Conference declared itself in

favor of going to Detroit, in 1903 and to San Francisco in 1904. The time of the meeting was left to the Executive Board.

Rabbi I. S. Moses moved that the papers on the Sabbath Question be printed and sent to all congregations. It was amended by A. Guttmacher, referring same to Executive Committee.

The invitation from the Louisiana Bar to attend its meeting was accepted with thanks.

The Committee on Nominations reported as follows:

Honorary President, M. Mielziner; President, Joseph Silverman; First Vice-President, Joseph Krauskopf; Second Vice-President, Samuel Sale; Recording Secretary, A. Guttmacher; Corresponding Secretary, Rudolph Grossman; Treasurer, Charles Levi; Executive Committee, J. Voorsanger, H. G. Enelow, L. M. Franklin, J. Stolz, T. Schanfarber, M. Heller, I. L. Leucht, G. Deutsch. These nominees were unanimously elected.

Rabbi Silverman declined the election as President, but was finally prevailed upon to accept.

Rabbi Sale declined the election as Second Vice-President, but the Conference refused to entertain the resignation and referred it to the Executive Committee.

The Committee on Nominations recommended the following amendment to the Constitution: "No member shall be eligible for the presidency for more than two successive terms."

A telegram was sent to B. Bettman that the Conference had voted \$2,000 to the Hebrew Union College.

The following resolutions were reported favorably by the Committee on Resolutions and adopted.

1. *Resolved*, That in the death of Dr. Salomon Mandelkern, Judaism has lost a scholar of international repute. As a Hebraist, historian and author of the Hebrew-Chaldaic Concordance he has rendered invaluable services to the Science of Judaism.

Your Committee begs to suggest that the incoming Executive Board be instructed to charge a competent author with the task of writing a brief biography of Solomon Munk, whose Centenary occurs August 5, 1902. This biography should lay special stress on Munk's discovery of the identity of Avicebron and Ibn Gabirol, by which the great influence which the Jews exercised upon the development of science in Mediaeval times was established.

Within a short time the visit of Professor Masaryk of Prague to these shores is expected. Prof. Masaryk has in his courageous defense of Leopold Hùlsner, of Polna, accused of ritual murder, placed himself by the side of such noble friends of Israel, as Reuchlin, Grégoire, Delitsch and Zola. Be it therefore

2. *Resolved*, That of the members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, a Committee be appointed to present to Prof. Masaryk on its behalf a set of resolutions expressing our sincere gratitude for his bold and unselfish defense of the cause of justice and humanity.

3. I herewith submit the following Amendment to the Constitution, Article VII, section 1, treating of the time of the meeting of the Conference.

This article to read: This Conference shall meet biennially at such time and place as the Conference may decide.

T. SCHANFARBER.

This resolution was referred to the next Conference.

4. *Resolved*, That the Executive Committee draw up a circular and point out to congregations the benefit of the Central Conference to Judaism and ask them to send their Rabbis to the Annual Convention.

JOSEPH SILVERMAN,
A. GUTTMACHER.

5. *Resolved*, That the Executive Committee be instructed to appoint a competent member to prepare a paper in reply to Harnack's presentation of Judaism in his *Wesen des Christenthums*.

G. DEUTSCH,
J. VOORSANGER,
J. HERZ.

6. *Resolved*, That the Executive Committee appoint as soon as possible a commission to present to the next Conference an expert answer (gutachten) to the seven questions propounded at the end of Rabbi Voorsanger's paper.

JOSEPH STOLZ,
A. GUTTMACHER.

Adopted.

The Committee on Thanks submitted the following report which was unanimously adopted:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THANKS.

Mr. President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN:—We, your Committee on Thanks, beg leave to submit the following expression as the sentiment of this Conference:

This Thirteenth Convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis is drawing to its deeply reluctant close. Profitable and pleasurable have been its deliberations, profitable and pleasurable has been our brief sojourn in this hospitable city where courtesy is as luxuriant as is this region's vegetation and where hearts are warmer than its climate. Before adjourning we wish to give expression to our grateful appreciation of the many and lavish kindnesses which we have here experienced, and like the surprised queen to King Solomon we can simply say that, while from reports and past acquaintance we, individually and collectively, anticipated much of the cordiality we have received, what we were prepared for was infinitely less than the half of what we have met with.

Our foremost thanks are due to our colleagues, Brothers Heller and Leucht, for the interest they have taken and created here in behalf of this convention. It is due to their fraternal enthusiasm and wisdom and work that all the local arrangements, which have been so admirable, were made, and that we found ourselves here in an atmosphere of such genial encouragement.

To the Jewish people of the community of New Orleans, who, through the combined local committee of their two congregations, Temple Sinai and the Touro Synagogue, have overwhelmed us with such magnificent entertainment and lordly attentions, we can not find words adequately to convey our thanks. It will be sufficient to say that we felt a blessing immediately upon our entrance, and it is with the blessing of appreciative regret that we depart from their midst.

Particularly do we thank the ladies of the local committee for their innumerable courtesies. They have provided for our refreshment alike in food and in spirit. We thank them and the other ladies of this city for gracing our meetings with their presence, for the sensitive sympathy and the delicate interest of their conversation which, in the intervals of our sessions, relieved the tedium of our deliberations, and for all the stimulus which the evidences of their womanhood's enthusiasm in the cause of Israel have given us one and all, so that we return to our sacred duties with renewed energies and inspirations.

We thank the Young Men's Hebrew Association for so kindly opening to us its doors for the needs of our convention, and for the evening of music and flow of soul with which its membership delighted us. We thank the Harmony Club for the generous hospitality which it evinced towards us. We thank the Touro Infirmary, the Julius Weis Home for Aged Jews, and the Jewish Widows' and Orphans' Home for welcoming us within their portals and introducing us to the noble monuments of charity for which the Jewish people of the City of New Orleans are so justly famed to the glory of American Israel. To the Young Men's Gymnastic Club and the Southern Athletic Club of this city we express our thanks for extending to our members the courtesies of their institutions.

Our thanks we extend likewise to Mr. Sol Marx for his successful efforts in securing our members the courtesies of the railroads in the matter of cheaper transportation, and to the railroads themselves for granting us these courtesies. Similarly we express our thanks to the United Fruit Company which, through the kindness of Mr. William Adler, regaled our Conference with the enjoyable excursion given us in their elegant steamship.

To the Howard Memorial Library of this city, which, through its librarian, Hon. William Beer, extended us an invitation to visit its institution, to the Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, which petitioned an address to its teachers and students by a representative of our Conference and gave so respectful attention to our brother, Professor Deutsch, who discharged this agreeable duty for us, and to the Louisiana State Bar Association which, through its president, Hon. Bernard McCloskey, extended our members an invitation to attend its annual meeting in the Supreme Court room, we express our sincerest thanks.

We are profoundly grateful to Temple Sinai and the Touro Synagogue for permitting us the use of their magnificent structures for the impressive opening and closing exercises of this convention and for the magnificent outstreaming of their congregations to both these occasions.

We thank Mayor Capdevielle for the warm and eloquent welcome with which, in the name of the citizens of New Orleans, he greeted us as friends and fellow-citizens, and made us feel at once at home in this proud metropolis of the South. To Dr. Alderman, President of Tulane University, we express our heartfelt gratitude for his address of stately oratory extending to us the hand of brotherhood and witnessing by his high evidence that learning and religion are twin sisters of the soul and equal necessities to man.

To the entire press of the City of New Orleans our very deepest acknowledgments of gratitude are owing. The reports of our proceedings in the public papers have been generously complete and exceptionally intelligent. For the interpretation of liberal Judaism thus given to the entire public of our country we are profoundly grateful alike to the editors and the reporters to whom we owe this eminent service done to Israel.

In thanking the good people of the City of New Orleans, we can not forego voicing again the prayer that God bless them particularly in speedily restoring to them wholly recovered from his sad accident their beloved minister and pastor, the Rev. Dr. B. M. Palmer, whom the Jews of this entire country have long known to love and to esteem as fervently as the people of his own city have long learnt to cherish him in the reverence of their hearts.

We recommend that these expressions of our thanks be properly conveyed in the customary manner and form to the individuals and the institutions herein mentioned.

And so, with thanks and with blessings, we bid a regretful Auf Wiedersehen to this city where knighthood is in flower and beauty holds undisputed empire.

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES P. JACOBSON, *Chairman.*

JOSEPH HERZ,

JACOB S. RAISIN,

Committee.

The Conference then adjourned sine die with a benediction by G. Deutsch.

The Conference Lecture was delivered by Rabbi Henry Cohen, of Galveston, Tex., on Friday evening, and the Conference Sermon by Rabbi Joseph Stolz, of Chicago, Ill., on Saturday morning. (See Appendix.)

APPENDIX.

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

BY RABBI JACOB VOORSANGER, Ph.D., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

This question, for the presentation of which, you have courteously given me a mandate, presents, in my opinion, the greatest issue of our modern religious life. No other question, from the nature of its conditions, presents such attractive or delicate aspects of discussion. No other question opens up wider vistas of thought or indicates greater possibilities of friction. Permit me to say in a purely personal way that no other question could, at this particular time, have brought me away from my home on a four days' journey, to meet with my brethren. But if we can make but a beginning towards the ultimate disposition of the issues involved in this question, I dare say none of us will have cause to regret any inconvenience, any wearisome toil, for the sake of the present well being, and the future happiness of our people. For both are involved in a successful, or unsuccessful, treatment, of this great problem.

I assume that the purport of the present discussion is, not in a mere negative way, to call public attention to the gradually lessening respect for Sabbath observance, nor unite in a mere courteous recommendation to our people to yield greater loyalty to our time-honored institutions. We have more important business than that. It seems to me that, having reviewed the situation it will be our duty to formally engage in an important and solemn discussion of the question whether the facts and data at our disposal will at all justify a proposition to recommend formal action in the uprooting of one of our most important historical institutions. I must say at the outset, that the very suggestion fills me with apprehension. It is an open question whether such a proposition can under any circumstances be entertained. This Conference is composed of rabbis and Jewish ministers, and there is nothing in its constitution that could warrant the suspicion that it would not desire to remain in

all and everything that affects our faith and religious practice upon distinct historical ground, so long as it can be maintained that the ground is historical, or that a departure therefrom is not a violation of the essential and fundamental principles upon which, by common consent, our faith is founded. Liberals we may be, but we are neither Sectarians nor Schismatics, nor, I take it, have we any desire to unite in any action whatever, by which, directly or remotely, we would create sect or schism in the confraternity of our people. But just at this point, many important considerations obtrude themselves. Has not the historical ground, as regards the Sabbath, been virtually cut away from beneath our feet? Is not the present flagrant contrast between theory and practice the strongest indication that so far as our American Jewish communities are concerned, the historical Sabbath has no more life in it, than had the prophet's dry bones, before their resurrection? And if all the life be gone out of this time-honored institution, is there any choice left between a candid confession of the fact, and a proposition to assimilate the distinctive principles underlying our Sabbath with those of the day of rest observed by the Gentile communities and a serious determined effort to remain as long as possible, upon historical ground, seek to reinvigorate the principles that have always obtained in Sabbath observance, and restore, if so much can be achieved, the spirit of the ancient Sabbath of Israel? These are questions, I take it, not unworthy the deepest consideration of a body of learned representatives of our people.

A superficial observer, less interested in the spiritual unity of Israel than we are, would perhaps find no difficulty in solving these questions at once. It would not occur to him that currents can be stemmed by deliberate, systematic and persistent action, nor would he think of the possibility of directing such currents into channels where their influence would be most beneficial. He would merely pass judgment upon the decaying and degenerating processes that arrest his attention, and conclude that the day of the flood was nigh. But overflowing rivers have been dammed, and floods have been stayed. Is it not at least possible that by a careful analysis of causes, we may contribute some suggestion whereby the historical Sabbath may remain a part of our spiritual inheritance to our

children? Is it not more consistent at least with our duty to exhaust every means of saving the Sabbath, before we finally confess that the new social and economic environments of our people justify our surrender? And if we finally did surrender, would we not owe the present and the future a solemn and careful statement of the reasons that justify so radical an action as the complete renunciation of one of our historical institutions?

These questions, it seems to me, clear the ground for action. Our first business then ought to be to make a correct diagnosis of the present situation. No matter how lamentable it is, let us hide nothing. If we desire to be spiritual physicians, let us not gloss over the ills that may confront us. Above all things, the truth is necessary. To hide it, or to refuse to acknowledge it, would simply mean a cowardly postponement of this question for an indefinite time, and that, surely, would be unbecoming men assembled for studying means by which to secure the permanency of their people's spiritual happiness.

It must be confessed, then, that the situation is serious enough. Two distinct principles unite in the institution of the Sabbath; the one, spiritual, the other physical. These two principles are briefly stated in the identical words of both decalogues, Exodus xx., 10, and Deut. v., 14. Spiritually, a Sabbath unto the Lord; a proclamation and celebration of the Divine Benignity, an emphasis of the Divine creative faculty, that having made the world maintains it in love and mercy; physically, a day, whereon to abstain from exercising wonted energies, so that redemption from incessant toil, deliverance from the burdens of daily cares and anxieties, might be the legitimate inheritance of people who believe in freedom, symbolized by the powerful suggestion of the Deuteronomist, who proclaims the Sabbath to be a memorial of our fathers' deliverance from Egyptian bondage. Whilst, presently, I will have occasion to return to this statement, it is here briefly presented, to note that to a very considerable extent, one of these two principles is fast becoming obsolete; and because of its close identity and union with the other, the latter is of needs affected, and its power and influence limited. In brief, Sabbath rest, so far as its public character is concerned, is nullified by the exigencies of the times, and the

public, as well as the domestic celebration of the day, is affected in consequence. This is a fact that admits of no discussion. We must look it straight in the face, and keep strict account with it. The fact that individuals keep the Sabbath, by no means affects the general statement. The latter is not only true as regards the centers of Jewish population in America, but the same facts may be noted in European centers, like Berlin and Paris. Jewish banks and counting houses are open on the Sabbath. Professional men are busy. Artisans pursue their toil, and the lamentable truth is that, even many who theoretically accept the Divine authority of the Sabbath commandment, ignore it practically, and pursue their daily avocation. Nor is this almost universal secularization of Sabbath, for the pursuit of labor, the greatest evil. Far exceeding the latter is, that the sanctifying influence of the day is becoming lost. The day has not retained its grasp upon the household. Women and children imitate their male relatives. Saturday begins to be a day whereon to discharge all the postponed duties of the week. The crowds of Jewish women, who preferably do their shopping on Saturday, might testify to the almost hopeless change that has taken place in the practice, if not actually in the sentiment, of our people. As regards the public celebration of the Sabbath, we can best prove how it is affected by the loss of its companion principle of rest, by pointing to our audiences. Whether the latter be large or small, whether the service be prolonged or brief, decorous or otherwise, the fact is that the attendance of men is utterly out of proportion to that of women, and the time may come when the total absence of men at the service will influence both the ritual and the instruction to the extent of adapting them to the wants of a single sex. This may sound ludicrous, but we really cannot tell what may betide in congregations, the men of which are reduced to the condition of mere contributors and business administrators, and whose women sustain the burden of maintaining the public celebrations as well as the domestic practices. If these facts are baldly stated, I maintain that they are facts, and no matter how much ground for rejoicing they will afford the would-be opponents of our liberal cause, we must present them concisely and truthfully, lest our sincerity in dealing with them be questioned,

and lest the very absence of that sincerity prevent us from clearly discerning our responsibilities in so grave and critical an issue.

On the other hand, however, it is our bounden duty to carefully analyze the causes that have led to this deplorable state of affairs. I deem it pertinent to say at this juncture that I must decline to allow the charge of indifference or convenience to be made a part of this discussion. That there are enough indifferent people with neither heart nor sentiment for the efficacy of religious agencies and the enforcement of a wholesome religious discipline, is true enough, and has always been true. But in the abstract, we have no right to assume that a people, otherwise always imbued with a correct perception of right, always loyal to its institutions, noted for the strength of its domestic virtues, a people capable of sacrifice on behalf of every element that can at all strengthen or perpetuate its vital principles; a people capable of the most enduring affection for its traditional legacies of truth and spirit, such a people I submit, cannot be assumed to be merely flagrantly and criminally indifferent to, or negligent of, one of the most important factors in its religious economy. Indifference is an effect, not a cause. It is in many instances, unconsciously perhaps, an expression of many antecedent causes, that have modified the social or spiritual environments, with which the individual desires to be in harmony. For in religion, as much, if not more so, than in social life, we require harmonious environments to secure our happiness. Man either adapts himself to his surroundings, or what is less frequently the case, surroundings adapt themselves to man. When the two, the man and the surroundings, do not harmonize, a condition of passiveness is likely to ensue, that the casual observer is sure to identify with indifference. But in the present instance, we must know whether that word stands for a paralysis of spiritual emotion, or for that passiveness that, for the present, expresses an inability to determine the processes by which the vital principles of our faith may again become potent factors in the activities of life. If the former, we may as well adjourn sine die. If the latter, I believe we should carefully classify the causes that have produced spiritual inactivity and indolence, and by aid of that classification, determine the means, if such exist, of restoring the harmony of Jewish faith and practice.

And this classification, I must again insist, must be no mere moralizing on the spirit of the times. The spirit of the times need not be invoked to account for all the ills that our religious practice has fallen heir to. Nor is it fair to denounce men because they seem to be involved in a vortex of operating causes. Rather let us blame, if blame we must, the obstinacy that prevents a full and free consideration of the processes that have their play with us, the latter molding us to activities we dare not now look plainly in the face, and forcing us to conclusions we lack the courage to acknowledge and carry into operation. Our duty therefore points to a presentation of causes, that have made the Sabbath the attenuated shadow of its former strength and beauty, and placed the communities of Israel in the remarkably incongruous attitude they occupy at present.

These causes, I respectfully submit, are threefold: Spiritual, Economic and Social; and so far as my time will permit they must be closely examined.

First. Admittedly, the institution of a Sabbath, already in pre-Mosaic times, bears a distinctly economic and social character. A day of rest is one of the earliest evidences of social culture. Before the Babylonian Moon Feasts became occasions for stated worship, they must have suggested a judicious conservation of human energies by an apportionment of time into periods of labor and rest. But it is unnecessary to venture so far back into the recesses of time. It is not only unnecessary, but distinctly unfair, to rob the Jewish institution of the Sabbath of its peculiar spiritual originality. In its crudest outlines, it stands upon a higher plane than the Moon Feast of the old time Semitic kinfolk of the Hebrews. Assuming that the selection of a seventh day is a mere characteristic of Semitic calendation and nothing else, it is nevertheless true that for the Jew and all the civilized nations of after times, the Mosaic Sabbath has furnished standards of interpretation which it has neither derived nor borrowed from any extraneous sources. The old Mosaic Sabbath is a unique institution. It is no mere acknowledgment of the necessity of conserving energy, and no mere factor in the social order; it is the first acknowledgment of an ideality that is sure to inspire man with a different view of his own position in the world.

It brings him a sense of his personal dignity. It develops his sense of freedom. It inspires him with humane sentiments towards his fellow men. This ideality lies imbedded in the decalogues, and it has been developed by the domestic environments of our people. Absolutely unassailable as this statement can be proved to be, we must nevertheless hold strict account with the development of the Sabbath in history, not merely as a social and religious, but likewise, as a political institution. The old Jewish commonwealth sought to protect the ideal and spiritual character of the Sabbath by the concrete character of legal enactments. It placed the institution under the protection of authority, and that authority was made imposing by the proclamation of its divine mandate. The interpretation of authority was that rigorous abstention from labor was to be the reflex of a divine rest at the end of creation. God had rested. Therefore man must rest. The principle of rest is, I should think, considerably affected by so solid a consideration. It must, in the public estimation, make considerable difference, whether an institution is founded in a Divine authority that has ordered its enactment as an integral element in a moral and political constitution, or is maintained merely by the free consent of a people, wisely imbued with the salutary characteristics of such an institution. It places before us in rugged contrast the two factors, that it seems to me, have always striven in Judaism for the mastery. That is to say, the legal discipline that always rested itself against a background of Divine authority, and the spiritual freedom, that never is able to admit the efficacy of a concrete and immutable discipline. For the history of the Sabbath, if we had ample time to venture into its details, might prove the gradually accumulating discipline to confirm authority, as well as the efforts of spiritual freedom to break through its slowly tightening trammels. We might illustrate the one by pointing to the massive legislation of the Talmud as subsequently codified, classifying various degrees of labor until almost nothing in the way of exercising energy is tolerated. We might illustrate the latter with copious quotations from the same source to prove the growing desire for ethical culture, and the acquisition of knowledge, as occupations eminently adapted to fill in hours of passive energy.

But the legal codes tell their own story, the story of an authority inherently qualified to dictate the conditions of rest as contradistinguished from the conditions of labor. They must be extremes, else the emphasis of authority is lost. The moral injunction to labor, can only be strengthened, if so that a Divine ordinance needs to be strengthened, by the moral prohibition to labor on the day of rest. So emphatic is the need of rest, so completely must it be an interpretation of the Divine rest, that the penalty of death is assessed against the offender. Society must be in harmony with the Creator, its conditions with those wrought by Him. It seems to me we cannot very well escape the conclusion that the Biblical account of the origin of the Sabbath was taken literally by our fathers, for despite any subsequent interpretation of social and religious discipline the prohibitive character of every kind of labor is altogether an attempt to translate into social conditions that absolute rest they believe to have existed on God's Sabbath. Now, if they did accept that account literally, and not as allegory or myth, as is sometimes suggested, we can readily understand the source of that authority that first consecrates the Sabbath to God, secondly, makes labor on that day a capital offense; and thirdly, directs the always active mind of man into the channels of education and spiritual contemplation. We know that the historical Sabbath has borne these characteristics. Now why does not that day present the same characteristics to us? Simply because, cavil as we may, apologize as we may, scold as we may, the cold fact is that spiritual authority has been steadily on the decline. We are confronted with the certainty that the spiritual suggestions of the Sabbath could at one time be enforced by political legislation; in a word, that the Sabbath as a Palestinian State institution, recognized by law as a valid factor in the people's happiness, expounded by an authority acknowledged of Divine origin, presents safeguards that it can never possess the moment it steps forth from these classical environments. And even if, in later times, the competent authorities possessed moral as well as social agencies whereby to enforce at least a moiety of the old discipline, what authority is sufficiently valid to-day to appeal to it for a direction of the moral energies of man, so long as the latter's activities do not come in conflict with the law?

And that is not all. Do we, ourselves, the teachers and ministers of the people, recognize any authority, from which aforesaid proceeded the moral and physical directions regarding this day? Let us look this question squarely in the face. This Conference and its successors must deal with issues that never yet confronted deliberative bodies of this character. We may be called upon, not merely to define what, under present circumstances and conditions, religious authority amounts to, but what is of the utmost, the gravest importance, whether new aspects of thought can be adapted to our religious economy, and whether we can remain on positive ground, notwithstanding the application of methods of criticism, whereby for the time being, authority is apparently undermined. It is my personal opinion that we can, though the processes whereby the new harmony is to be developed are not yet wholly clear to me. In the meantime, however, we too are affected by the decline of authority, and in a greater degree than our people, because we are more sensitive to the changes that the new schools have wrought. I know perfectly well, and I will claim it before I will conclude, that a belief in the Divine Law need not be affected by the mechanism that when thoroughly understood, is apt to give that law a firmer and more conscious expression. But how has the new doctrine of evolution, for instance, affected, for the time being, our belief in the divinity of institutions that have proved to be mere expressions of social order, or that, as in this present instance, have proved to be much older than the conventional era of the creation itself. If we believe the Sabbath to be a copy from an older Babylonian institution, as in a measure it is, can we continue to endow it with the traditional interpretation that it is divinely ordained, and that in addition to the characteristics heretofore adduced, the pledge of its authority comes from its being a covenantal sign between God and His people, and therefore, like other covenantal signs, inextinguishable as long as Judaism remains an affirmative expression of the relations of God and man? I cannot tell to what extent these considerations appear to you as important. To me they appear grave enough. When the authority of the day is shaken by the absence of social, political and ethical safeguards, when the origin of the day, historically and archæologically considered, contradicts

the statement of the traditions, when people prove by their attitude that in some way they know these things; how, unless we turn the dials of time backward, can we restore this old institution to its original status and endow it with an authority that shall not be opposed or questioned?

Second. The present economic aspects of the Sabbath question next invite our consideration. It is here that we are strikingly confronted with the contest of the progressive forces of our own times with the old order, representing the historical influences that always clamor for recognition. A Palestinian Sabbath, so far as its injunctions of rest are concerned, has been, for a long time past, an utter impossibility. Assuming even the possibility of its restoration, the old time interpretations and conditions of rest are not only untenable, but they appear absurd, and religious absurdities afford the strongest encouragement to indifference. The Sabbath, as has been stated, was a state institution, the ideality of which was developed by safeguards, that came from the spirit of popular legislation. The history of the growth of rabbinical discipline cannot be made a part of this paper, but it must be consulted to account for the rigor with which abstention from labor was enforced. All I wish to note here is that within state environments, or within domestic environments that are not considerably affected by exterior agencies, it is possible to observe a Sabbath in obedience to every minute direction of discipline. The moment these environments change, discipline becomes immediately affected. Labor in Palestine had no competition, not even the stranger within the gate, nor an alien was permitted to labor on the Sabbath. From the nature of the Jewish constitution, there could not have been any liberal interpretation of the law of rest, any exemption whatever, except in the well known instances of life saving and life preserving. Hence, a legal observance of the Sabbath, aside from its moral and educational considerations, created no material loss. Society was a unit in its observance. The seventh day, within such environments, is as completely and as strictly a *dies non*, as is the Sunday of the American people, which, without consideration of its legal, or moral, aspects, is, by consensus, a day whereon to abstain from labor. Now, it is all well enough from a religious point of view, to

insist upon a traditional day of rest as being the only one worthy of celebration and observance, but religion will not suffer if it keeps account with the economic questions that are involved in such insistence. To demand compliance with the biblical injunction, as we understand it, means to insist upon our people observing two days of rest. I believe that to be the fact. I have never been able to endorse any Jewish appeal to the courts of the country for protection of the exercise of the functions of labor when the appellant sought to equalize his energies by laboring on Sunday. I believe such appeals to be poor policy, for they only serve to emphasize the gravity of our situation, and answer no questions whatever, except that in individual cases, they help to compound the losses that accrue from Sabbath observance. To be sure, I am not disposed to deny the conscientious attitude of such appellants, nor their religious scruples, but can it be denied that back of such appeals lies the grave fact, that no man, so situated, can compete with the exercise of five days of energy against his neighbor who exercises six days? This is the problem we have to confront. Sunday, aside from every other consideration, is the popular day of rest. All business is suspended on Sunday. The wheels of industry cease to revolve on Sunday. Not a single religious consideration that we might present could induce the American people to change its consensus in that matter. Our people are but a very small minority. We are barely three per centum of the population of the United States, and though our volume of business may far exceed that percentage, it is not so large in the aggregate, that we can venture upon a trial of strength with our neighbors. Business has no soul. The energy of man in the pursuit of legitimate channels of operation stops at no obstacle except such as are placed in its way by law. Three Jewish citizens of the United States are in full and open competition with ninety-seven citizens of other faiths, or no faith, under this condition; the three Jews are expected to succeed by the exercise of five days of energy in at least the same degree that the others achieve by the exercise of six days. How this can be done I do not know. To my mind it could only result in the systematic, if gradual, and ultimate, pauperization of the Jew. It must be borne in mind that the conditions which environ the American Jew

are different from those of his brother abroad. He has not created those conditions, but they have in a large measure affected him. The spirit of the American Sunday is more rigid, more intolerant, more exacting. Even though the constitution permits no sumptuary legislation, and therefore every man may follow the dictates of his conscience, the traditions of Sunday observance show the advisability of every man training his conscience in harmony with that of the people. Labor on Sunday will not be offensively resented, but it will be passively discouraged. No man can very well succeed in the exercise of his energies when all around him there is a complete suspense of energy. The success of labor depends upon the general exercise of its functions. Now success is an element of life that even religion dares not to underrate. The preaching of sacrifice, of the subordination of self-interest to principle and consistency, is the presentation of a magnificent ideal and of a sublime theory of faith; but, unhappily, we will find very few people who will consent to immolate their self-interest at the altar of Faith. Nor need we criticise them too severely. Material prosperity is no inconsiderable factor in social happiness, and even the well-being of our communal institution depends very largely upon the degree of prosperity our people enjoy. With the decline of such prosperity, we may count upon the decay of our institutions. Now I may be confronted with the assertion that many of our people observe the Sabbath and thrive wondrously. I would answer that we are to make no decisions from individual cases but are to study the question itself. I would further say that wherever the Jew lives in environments that do not bring his energies into conflict with those of his neighbor, as for instance, in centers where our people are massed together, and where they pursue certain exclusive lines of industry, it is possible for them to keep the Sabbath. But a million and a half of American Jews, scattered throughout all the cities, towns, villages and hamlets, whose business affairs bring them in open and active competition with their neighbors, can only observe their Sabbath at the loss of one-sixth of their energy, which must eventuate in a reduced capacity to earn a livelihood, and hence in poverty. Again, from a religious point of view that may not look very formidable,

since consistency is proclaimed both a virtue and a duty; but from the economic point of view, we are virtually dealing with an impossible proposition. Saturday is an important day in American industries. It is paying and distributing day. The half holiday institution of some of the large cities has not found general sympathy, because conditions vary with locality. But, wherever he may be, the Jewish wholesale merchant, the banker, the manufacturer, the artisan, and the unskilled laborer, owe obligations, which appear to be distinctly in conflict with their religious obligation. The banker cannot refuse to pay out money. The merchant and the manufacturer cannot impose upon their employees a duty of distributing their energies over five days. The artisan, who would be the greatest sufferer, cannot be expected to maintain his family at one-sixth less than keeps his fellows, for with them he shares the responsibilities of a social position, and therefore must enjoy an equal income. This economic difficulty is perhaps at the bottom of all our trouble, and from its point of view it may be seriously doubted whether any remedy can at all be devised to encourage and promote a better observance of the Sabbath. And yet, I must submit, even this grave aspect of the question ought not to induce us, as the Breslau Conference of 1846 bravely said, "to throw a three-thousand-year-old tradition overboard." We are not yet ready to confess that the future has nothing in store for our Sabbath but an assimilation with the National day of rest.

Third. As regards the social aspects of this great question, they might lead us into lengthy considerations of the evolution of our social life, with which, too, strict account must be kept. A people's religious practice is considerably influenced by its social environment. The social life of Israel in its native land, the social life of the Diaspora, the social life of the Ghetto, the present social life of Jewish communities in the various countries into whose nations they are incorporated, all present considerations that would lead to conclusions opposing the possibility of a uniform practice, as regards even many essential characteristics of religious observance. The latter will always seek to harmonize with its social surroundings. Many of the old-time restrictions of labor harmonize with the social life of old Israel. Sabbath rest

needed a social atmosphere, wherein to develop according to every conceivable detail. Principle and law were fixed and made concrete by pronouncements and interpretations, as well as by custom; whence comes the fact that any Halakha admitted in theory derives its vitality from Teqanoth, Gezeroth, and Minhagim, just as in our modern jurisprudence the status of the law is fixed by popular practice and decrees of court. These three anciently fixed the status of practice, but they cannot fix it permanently, for they are the mechanism only to bring principles of faith and practice in harmony with the life of the community. It is therefore easy to understand that two elements always come into conflict with one another in a consideration of almost every Jewish question; the traditional aspect of the question, which always refers to the old order, that is to say, its status in former times, and the modern aspect, which refers to the social changes that have affected the old status. Now, it is popularly believed that so far as religion is concerned, custom must be concrete. One is supposedly a good Jew when in matters religious, he lives and moves in a rabbinical atmosphere, which means, that in his practices and observances, he stands upon the law and the principle, environed by the mass of rabbinical decisions and interpretations that have, of course, become a part of the law. That means to say, that the possibility is admitted of living in two distinct atmospheres, one distinctly national, which means the acquisition and absorption of national characteristics, the other religious, which means the maintenance of social, as well as religious practices, which belong, strictly speaking, to the national life of a bygone time. Theoretically, that may be possible. Practically, it is possible only in individual cases, and must be explained upon special grounds. One might assume the possibility of a complete assimilation with the life of the Nation on the one hand, and an accompanying withdrawal into an atmosphere of esoteric religion on the other, but from a community point of view that is impossible. If it be our duty, and it undoubtedly is, to permit full sway to the assimilating processes of the times, whereby every Jew is welded into the body of citizenship that composes the Nation, and molded for his responsibilities as a factor in the common good,

we cannot place any restrictions on the growth of his sentiment as regards his social freedom. The atmosphere of social and religious life must harmonize. If that harmony consists in the removal, rather than the creation of restrictions, we certainly must stand our ground. I wish to contribute but one of many illustrations in point. It seems to me that many of the social restrictions regarding the Sabbath date from the same era to which we must attribute the rise of rabbinical discipline, that is to say, the centuries immediately succeeding the time of Ezra, when, in fact, the status of the Palestinian Sabbath, as we know it, became fixed. I would infer this from a Talmudical statement that the enactment of the prohibition known as "Muqzah" dates from the time of Nehemiah (Talmud Babli Sabbath, page 123; compare Moses Brueck, *Rabinische Ceremonialgebraeuche*, etc., Breslau, 1837). Muqzah may be briefly defined as a prohibition to handle any vessel or instrument used in the trades and occupations which are forbidden on the Sabbath. Now it is clear that such a prohibition must have had far-reaching influence in determining both the social and the moral aspects of Sabbath observance. It puts a barrier on every kind of energy, and regulates thought itself, as it dwells on the difficult question of what to do, or not to do. To be sure, considered from an archæological point of view, we can understand the ethical background of such a prohibition. But our considerations are practical, not archæological. How would such a prohibition, with all the hardships it entails, apply to our present social environment? In fact, who, born and reared in our latter day surrounding, can even mentally assimilate the fact that the deliberate or accidental touching of a knife, used for labor, or an axe, is a grave infraction of the Divine commandment of rest? This impossibility to appreciate the practical value of rabbinical interpretation is not a matter of ignorance, nor a deliberate rejection of its wisdom. It is purely a matter of changed social aspects, a change of social environments within which life has become a different thing from what it has been in former days. So has it come to pass that what unreasonable critics are pleased to call irreligion is largely the operation of an assimilating tendency. We have adapted ourselves to our environments. That is all. Our social life is Occidental,

not Oriental. We have grown up in wider, broader conceptions of life. You cannot teach your American charges, accustomed to healthy exercise, that a walk beyond a fixed limit is an offense against God, nor can you insist that producing music on Friday evening is a thing so unlawful that it must be abhorred. You cannot teach your people, for they would not understand you, that the noblest ideal of Sabbath rest is to sit still and do nothing, or that their leisure hours may not be occupied with some pleasant task that is a diversion from the week's systematic toil—in a word, the very spirit of Sabbath rest has changed because the popular idea of rest has changed; because the social life, for better or for worse, has changed; because, further, it is an impossibility to perpetuate old time interpretations among a people that are forever learning from their neighbors, hence forever adapting themselves to the life of which theirs is a part. Here we are again confronted with very serious questions. What interpretation have we to offer to the demand for the perpetuation of the social ideals of the Sabbath, when we know that the old interpretations have wholly lost their force, and the people grow restive beneath a repeated charge that every act of theirs that contradicts the old standards is an act of irreligion inconsistent with their professions? Can we regulate either the public or the domestic character of Sabbath by new interpretations? Can we guard against the gradual decline of the Sabbath at home, when people no longer know what is considered right or wrong, or is it safe or advisable, to return to the conservative ground that regulates every act and custom, that admits no freedom of interpretation, that upholds every old standard, and assumes an attitude of resentment towards every supposed offender? I said, shall we return to conservative ground; can we? Can we change the tide of life, or can we create a distinct domestic atmosphere for the Sabbath so intolerant of personal freedom that our homes become once more locked in the shackles of an uncompromising discipline? It seems to me that all theorizing on this subject, only tends to make our situation appear more aggravating.

And now, two questions. Can we restore the Sabbath? Can we reconcile the progressive forces of our own times with the

historical influences, from which, in a considerable degree, we find it still impossible to alienate ourselves?' The reply to these two questions must not, cannot be furnished by an individual. My task has been the presentation of causes which, in my own opinion, hinder the general observance of the traditional Sabbath. But I have not yet admitted, and I cannot admit, that these self-same causes constitute a valid argument for any synodical action, looking to the assimilation of the Jewish day of rest with that observed by other people. Back of observances lie historical principles, and the sacrifice of the latter is more to be feared than the decline of discipline. The non-observance of Sabbath by millions of Jews does not invalidate the fact that as an historical institution, it represents principles, that are a part of the life blood of our religion. Upon the face of this presentation, it might be easy for some to readily pronounce the impending doom of the Sabbath and its ultimate extinction, but that seems not yet very clear to me. I wish to stand as long as I can on historical ground. The Sabbath is one of those powerful elements that have given our religious system that distinct individuality that has made it the source of other systems, and I question whether the elimination of so great an element does not involve the gravest danger to the system itself. Such a contingency cannot be entertained with equanimity. If the trend of our American life in this matter is toward the popular recognition of Sunday, not merely as a day eminently convenient for public worship, but for the enunciation of the principles inherent in the Sabbath, then I believe we are on the eve of a sectarian movement that may eventuate in the third and fourth generation in our being cut off from the confraternity of Israel. If I am not mistaken in that assumption, the plain proposition would be an inquiry into the means of guarding against such an eventuality. The question concerns us deeply. Religion, with us, means more than a mere acknowledgment of ethical principles, more than a compliance with traditional discipline, more than a classification and profession of theological statements. Religion, with us, means also a maintenance of the continuous identity of Israel as God's missionary for the transmission of those truths held efficacious in teaching and saving the

world. That identity of Israel, I maintain, must be a distinct spiritual identity, aside from those considerations by which we perpetuate our physical life and existence as one of the great families of mankind. That spiritual identity, I submit, involves a maintenance of historical principles. We deal here with no mere discipline, the shifting character of which can be historically determined. We deal here with no mere custom, nor with rabbinical decrees and decisions. We deal with an institution, one of the oldest, held to be divinely ordained, and so still expressed in our rituals. However we may interpret the statement of its divine origin, that institution is indissolubly interwoven with other elements that make up our religious system. To eliminate it, means breaking through the entire system. Now, is the contingency of a sectarian movement such a dangerous one? That question, of course, has its sides and views. My side and my view are that I am a Jew and wish to remain a Jew, that my children are Jews, and that so far as all my moral and intellectual responsibilities extend, I wish to preserve the solidarity and identity of the people whose teacher I am. I have no mission to create or further new religious systems. If it be true that the latter are born, not made, my responsibility lies and will always lie with my own people in the conservation of those integral elements of faith, that have permitted our Judaism to survive the uprising of all other systems. Members of the oldest spiritual confraternity, let us not hug the false ambition of becoming founders of the latest. These views may be narrow, but narrowness in this matter is a virtue. We must guard if we can against breaking the chain of centuries. The moment we break the chain, we will realize how wide will be the chasm that will separate us from our people all over the world. Let those who can dwell on the contingency with pleasure. To me it is a matter of the gravest, most anxious concern. It seems to me, therefore, that this Conference has much business in hand.

The following considerations occur to me as effective in the future treatment of this question:

1. This Conference should authorize an official statement regarding its position in the matter of the Sabbath.

2. This Conference should define as a matter of information to the people the difference between a mere Sunday service and the endowment of Sunday with the characteristics and significance of Israel's historical Sabbath.

3. This Conference should define, if possible, the spiritual authority that guides and directs the religious practice of our people.

4. This Conference should inquire whether the ideas of rest involved in the Sabbath can at all be made adjustable to the present economic conditions, and whether, in view of our present difficulties, other ethical interpretations than those that have hitherto obtained, may not be suggested.

5. This Conference should inquire whether the institution of a Sunday Sabbath is, or is not, inconsistent with the historical and theological principles underlying the same, and whether or not such an institution would not be productive of schismatic action, by which its advocates would expose themselves to the possibility of creating a new sect in the midst of the Jewish people.

6. This Conference should urge a more emphatic, more solemn celebration of the Sabbath, and should appeal to the men of our people to attend the public service, even if economic reasons make their rest impossible.

7. This Conference should particularly look for the means whereby the domestic character of the Sabbath can be enhanced, and endeavor, by incessant appeal and unremitting instruction,* to preserve within the domestic environments the spirit of Sabbath rest and devotion.

Whether in any or all of these considerations there lies a remedy for our besetting evil, time alone will tell. There are doubtless other considerations to be offered. Out of the careful, honest purpose of a body of strong men, much good may be developed. Knowing the gravity and extent of the evil, we may be better equipped to treat it. On the 14th day of July, 1846, at the Breslau Conference, in introducing the same issue, its famous President, Abraham Geiger, used the following memorable words with which I must conclude my study of this great question:

"It is to be assumed that in the treatment of so radical an evil

many a member of the conference, as a pure matter of theory, will present drastic remedies, and in consequence utterances will be made, which, to some may appear sarcastic or offensive. But, if anywhere, freedom of speech must here remain unassailed, and every one must be permitted to express his opinion. From the other side we may hear that, just because of the difficulties of the times it is so much more necessary to cling to that which obtains and that just on that account, concessions are not to be tolerated. These conflicting opinions must be considered but from one point of view—the effort to sanctify life through days of rest and devotion. Whilst we will remember what sacrifices the Jewish people, since former days, gladly and willingly have brought, we dare not ignore the chasm that is now in existence. Let us therefore to our labors with courage, but also with caution. It is of course to be anticipated that we may not arrive at a completely satisfactory solution of this question, and that, therefore, we cannot bring about a complete restoration, but here, too, applies the old adage—‘not upon thee rests the duty to complete the work, neither art thou at liberty to withdraw from it’—What we commence, later conferences will continue, and out of the principles we shall be able to enunciate, the future will extract the necessary conclusions.”

Let this utterance of the great leader of German Jewish thought be the keynote of our deliberations, and may our God direct our ways for the happiness and peace of our people.

Dr. Harrison had not returned his paper up to the time of going to press.—EDITOR.

DISCUSSION OF THE SABBATH QUESTION.

OPENED BY RABBI JACOB S. RAISIN.

Concerning the great Emden-Eibeschutz controversy of which Professor Deutsch can tell you so much, there is a legend current among the Russian Jews, to the following effect:

When the discussion between the doctors reached its climax, the eyes of European Jewry turned to the rising light in the East, the Gaon of Wilna, and asked him to intercede, as they felt confident that, by such intercession, it would put an end to it. But to this the Great One modestly replied:

"I cannot put my head between the crushing mountains." Need I tell you, my friends, that I am now placed in a similar predicament—the more so, because of the magnitude of the subject at hand, and the inferiority of the man who is to discuss it? And yet, the cause is so great, and is fraught with so much importance for the safety and perpetuity of our holy religion that I, even I, would venture to say a few things with regard to it, and though my words may be weak, and my voice feeble, yet, emanating as they do from the bottom of my heart, they may find a proper lodgment within yours.

The paper read by our eminent colleague, of San Francisco, was so thorough and exhaustive, that, unlike Boaz, he left nothing for me to glean after him. But as Boaz presented Ruth, before her departure, with seven grains, so did he also kindly give me the outline of his essay, as well as a few hints in addition to it. It is upon this, and also upon what we have heard him read, that I shall base my remarks.

We were told that the indifference, which is now witnessed everywhere among our reformed Jews with regard to everything Jewish, was not a cause, but the result of the deplorable state into which Sabbath observance has fallen. We were told that modern, spiritual, economic and social conditions all tend to contribute to the laxity with which the holy day of rest and worship is now beset

—and that all are making for the disintegration of this time-honored and inrooted institution of Judaism. The conclusion, therefore, is self-evident. Since the Saturday Sabbath can no longer be maintained, let us substitute a Sunday Sabbath in its stead. Let us transfer the *day* of rest to the day of *rest*, and then everything will be all right again. Shift it but to the day following it, the day recognized by the State, and by the majority of our citizens, as the official day wherein all toil and labor must cease, and its glory will be renewed as of old, and Israel will be once more blessed with the sanctity and consecration of a Sabbath rest.

Gentlemen, do you consider what this means for Judaism? It means the uprooting of one of its most vital and salient institutions—it means the abrogation of what is most characteristic of, and indispensable to, its existence. Need you be reminded of how much we bore and endured at all times and, in all climes, because of the Sabbath—that it alone, above all other commandments, we are enjoined to reverence and keep holy—that it alone, more than anything else, has been given to us as a covenant between God and Israel *forever*? Need I remind you, learned colleagues, of the supreme importance attached to it by our Sages of the Talmud—that whole treatises were written as to its observance, and that, according to them, one Sabbath properly kept is enough to redeem Israel from all its sufferings?

Historically the transference of Saturday to Sunday is impossible. If, as all agree, there are, in every individual, innate forces from which he can never extricate himself, in which, do what he will, he must move and live and have his being, and to which he must slavishly subscribe till the chord of life is rent asunder, the Jew, after four thousand years of Saturday observance is no more able to sanctify Sunday than to believe in a trinity or a duality. The Jew may gradually lose, yes, he may be robbed (as he now is) of his Sabbath, he will never recognize Sunday as a fit and adequate substitute for it. Bury the Sabbath on Friday night, as a prominent rabbi said, and you will never see its resurrection on Sunday, to change the well known aphorism of Dr. Einhorn.

Yes, let us say with our rabbis: It is better that they profane one Sabbath than Sunday in addition to it.

But what of the modern, pressing, economic and social problems? Do they not necessitate a change?

And would it not be advisable to save at least part of the Sabbath by holding services on Sunday? Friends, I, for one, am the last man to oppose Sunday service. Would that we could have services every day and all day, as the doctors of the Talmud said. But it is for the Sabbath day that I contend. Can we, and if so, shall we, transfer it to Sunday? Shall we, because it may involve a loss of money to some, allow the transgression of Saturday to all? Mean, indeed, must be the man who does not blush before his own conscience to uphold such a reason. Shame upon those who would sell their principles for a mess of pottage! Shame upon those who would not sacrifice a paltry dollar on the altar of their faith! Shame upon those who are Jews with their mouths, but are so no longer, when it comes to their pockets!

Shall we give up our traditional day of rest because we live in a Christian country, and are in a minority? Friends, who has heard of a minority yielding to a majority in matters religious? Why, the moment we recognize the rulings of the majority in affairs of faith, we preclude the possibility of freedom of thought and conscience. We might as well surrender our belief in the unity of God and the sovereignty of reason and subscribe to a trinity and the thousand and one superstitions, rampant among our countrymen, for no better reason than because we are in a minority.

But some will claim, Judaism has a world-wide mission, and, in order to reach all, we must teach it and preach it on the day when all are at leisure to come and listen to it. Ah, the same old cry, the mission of Israel! And have we not a mission first and foremost to our own bone and flesh? You all know, as well as I, of the hundreds of thousands of our unfortunate co-religionists from Russia and Rumania and Galicia and Hungary that yearly seek shelter on our shores. They are, mostly, strictly orthodox—these poor brethren of ours. And yet, those of you who hail from such cities as New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Baltimore, etc., may perhaps recall the picture of their coming into our temples on a Saturday moving with their *Talethim* on their shoulders under their coats, their handkerchief about their necks, coming to listen to the

reformed rabbi or the *Prediger*. They will not come to us any other day. We have a mission to the Jews first of all, and it is only by preserving our Saturday Sabbath that we can introduce the principles of reform in the camp of orthodoxy.

And after all, my friends, suppose even we ignore this in the delusive hope that our orthodox brethren will be able to work out their own salvation, will we reach our gentile neighbors on Sunday? Can we reasonably expect to be more successful than the Church itself? If despite the labor of a strongly organized body with the State and society at its beck and bidding, sparing no effort to attract the outsider, there are still more than fifty per cent. unchurched and over one-half of the remaining fifty per cent. who do not worship, how can we possibly expect to win over any at all? We are pursuing empty shadows. If we have any mission to the Gentiles and are willing to do something in its behalf, let us send out missionaries to tell them what we aim at, and what we stand for; let us open evening courses of lectures, and let our great speakers proclaim the truths of our faith. But, in the name of sound reason and common sense, let us not labor under the vain delusion that by transferring Sabbath to Sunday, we will accomplish our object.

In one of his lectures, Dr. Krauskopf tells us with great satisfaction of the multitudes that crowd to his Temple on Sunday, and infers from this there must be an obvious demand for a Sunday Sabbath. But this eminent divine modestly forgets that it is not because of the day, but rather because of his personality that people flock to listen to his message, and that the same phenomenon would be witnessed whenever and wherever he might speak, in the Temple or elsewhere, on Sunday, or on any other occasion.

I appeal, sirs, for the preserving of the traditional Sabbath. Think of the consequences which such a drastic change will eventually produce. The moment we recognize the resurrection day of Christianity, we will also sound the death-knell of Judaism. But this is not all. The eyes of thousands of Saturdinarian Christians in our own country and abroad are turned to us intently watching our proceedings, anxiously awaiting the result of our deliberations. They look to us for inspiration and encouragement. They yearn to return to the original source of light, the Old Testament, and

this is their first step toward it and an earnest of it. Here, indeed, is our mission to the Gentiles. Here is an opportunity and shall we fail to grasp it?

Again, almost every great law of the Torah has a reason, a legend if you please, for its existence, "When thy child will ask thee," occurs more than once in Holy Writ. What then will we have to say to our little ones when they shall put to us the question, why and wherefore do we discard the Sabbath, the day on which we tell them God Himself rested from His work? Will it not lead us to inculcate in them from their earliest infancy the opinion that principle is below pleasure, that convenience is above conviction?

And then, my friends, think of the split and schism which this is bound to cause in the camp of the Jews. As soon as we recognize Sunday as Sabbath, we sever our connections with the old stock, which we can ill afford. We must not be instrumental in dividing the house of Israel against itself. We are all irrefragably connected with our ancestors, and you know the pain and suffering which such an act must entail. Our decision will not be accepted by the great majority of our people. We cannot tell them, as said Paul: "Slaves, obey your masters." We shall simply open a wound which we will never be able to heal again.

Let us not be like the man of whom it was reported, that before committing suicide, he put his valuables in the safe deposit and lost only his life. In transferring Sabbath to Sunday, we are in danger of being equally wise. We are in danger of saving and enhancing the property of our people at the cost of their religious life. In no convention where the Sabbath question was brought up, in 1845, 1869 and 1871, those great conventions in which such men as Geiger, Hirsch, Adler and Einhorn were the leading spirits, was such an action deemed advisable or desirable. They were brave souls, those fathers of our reformation, who lived in another country and spoke a language different from our own. Nothing would have induced them to stand by the historical Sabbath if they were convinced that Judaism must needs have and can be rehabilitated by another Sabbath, a *Shabbath Sheni*. They were well aware that to save Judaism by introducing a Sunday Sabbath, we will act like

the man who would save himself from the conflagration in the cellar by escaping with all his possessions to the story above.

About the middle of the sixth century a Christian Conference was held in New Orelans, wherein it was decided that no manner of work be done on the day of the Lord. Let us at this Jewish Conference, meeting in the City of New Orleans equally decide that nothing can supersede the day of our Lord, the sacred, traditional, four-thousand-year-old Sabbath, the day pregnant with so many elevating and ennobling recollections—the day which so attuned the souls of our ancestors that they vibrated in happy harmony with the great and good universe. Let us decide unconditionally to preserve and perpetuate this great day of peace and rest of the soul for the glory of the God of Israel and mankind.

I. LEWINTHAL : We are dealing with the seventh day Sabbath. The Mount Sinai Sabbath. The Sabbath day which we are told to "remember." There is no use to argue against this particular day. Tradition tells us which day is meant, and we cannot go back of tradition. We may endeavor to reason that God don't care on which day we rest. Or we may reason that Sunday is the popular Sabbath. Or, we may even say that if we are honorable in the conduct of our affairs, we are doing well enough and we need no Sabbath. And so we may go on reasoning for the purpose of reasoning ourselves out of any Sabbath.

Now, I do not think that any necessary work should not be performed on our Sabbath; I, on the contrary, do think that all necessary work may be done on the Sabbath, because we expect that all people will—in some future time—keep the self-same day, and if then no work may be done at all, I cannot see how all the people can ever have the same day of rest, and if it may be done then, it may be done now. I believe in a Sabbath, not only because we need physical recreation, but I believe in a Sabbath because we need communion with our Maker. We seek that communion when we are children, and we seek it again more, when we are of riper years. In the summer of our lives, when all is in full vigor, when every sinew of our body is a rock, when we look upon our existence as our own creation, when we feel our strength and never

know of weakness, then we may not, and very few do in that period of their lives, seek communion with the Eternal. Some do even laugh at the idea, and may even ridicule others for such devotional inclinations. But in our childhood and in our advanced years, God the Eternal lives in us. Then we enjoy the Sabbath. We enjoy it on account of the sanctity in it. We feel the holiness of the day if we take time to think about it and if we shape our surroundings to conform to our feelings.

The Sunday Sabbath can never become a holy day and I hope that the backbone of our Sabbath will still remain firm and unbroken. If we respect ourselves, all that need be done is to keep the Sabbath day holy.

The sacredness of the Sabbath should be preserved by all and every means, and nothing should be allowed in our shrines of worship that may detract from it.

Since the proclamation of the law on Sinai, our people have been habituated to observe the seventh day of the week as a day of rest and religious edification, as a testimony of God's creation, and of His Covenant with and revelation in man. Christianity has transferred the day of rest to the first day of the week in its effort to create distinctions between Judaism and herself. If we should follow her example now in this instance, we surrender to her the most precious boon bestowed by God on Judaism as our rabbis call the Sabbath, and abolish a landmark of faith which has kept Israel on the road of religious enlightenment in his toilsome and hardship-beset wanderings through ages past.

If our people feel the necessity of religious instruction and edification they ought to make some little sacrifice for it. If they need religion let them begin by observing the Sabbath. Must the religious laws and institutions be perverted and subverted for convenience sake? It would surely not become the dignity of the Synagogue to make such a sacrifice or to run such a risk.

Religion is a stable, positive law, and cannot and should not be toyed with to indulge in momentary whims or fancies. We should insist upon the sacredness of the Sabbath.

The Sabbath can be restored if earnest and determined efforts are made to bring about a more general observance of the day. The

sturdy, practical sense of our people can be relied on to devise efficient measures if once they are thoroughly aroused to the necessity of carrying out the Divine command, to the need of preserving Judaism.

It is idle to talk of a vital Judaism so long as one of the fundamental commands is generally neglected, so long as sacrilege is committed upon one of its integral principles.

Now as to Sunday services. The principal objection to Sunday services is that they lead to the suspension of Sabbath services, and ultimately to the transferring of the Sabbath to Sunday. True, it is meritorious and edifying to worship God on any day and at any time; but simplify your Sunday services as much as you may; say that you will have no religious services at all, but merely lectures and discussion on religious subjects—the effect will be the same—the crowding out of the seventh day Sabbath, and besides, the success of the Sunday services have been at the direct expense of the Sabbath.

Another fact is, to attend simply public worship is not observing a Sabbath. We know that in the case of the Marranos, who could never meet in sufficient numbers to hold a public service, yet they remained true and loyal to their faith!

Religion demands sacrifices in many if not every respect. To remember the Sabbath in order to keep it holy, is a sacrifice to be made by Jews so long as the Christians will keep the first day of the week. Whenever they return to and keep the old Sabbath, then there will be no more sacrificing on the part of the Jewish people above the Christian people, then all will sacrifice alike.

Will that day ever come? "On that day the Eternal is One, and His Name is One."

H. G. ENELow: At one juncture a feeling of disappointment came to me as I listened to the paper. It was when its deduction, conclusion, became untrue to the entire trend of the argument, as if the honored speaker at the last moment flinched from the position that he was about to take. He felt forced, it would seem, to give expression to the hope that after all the old Sabbath may be re-vitalized and re-instituted. I do

not impeach the sincerity of his belief in this hope—I will not even say in this connection that it may not be possible to bring that about—but I feel disappointed at the unexpected, unwarranted turn the paper took towards the close. Particularly so, since I have realized for some time that so many of us have been evading the true problem—that we have been eschewing or minimizing the true impost of this question. The leading word in all our discussions of the Sabbath question, has been the attendance at the Divine services, the Sabbath “audience.” Now, I do not believe this to be the pivot of the problem. To me it seems that no matter what your “audiences” may be on Saturday morning or on Friday night—no matter how large your congregations may be—you cannot deny the fact that all the same we have no Sabbath, no day of rest. I make a confession this afternoon that I never feel more like a hypocrite than when I stand up on Friday nights and Saturday mornings and pray thus: “Grant, O Lord, that our rest on this Sabbath may be acceptable to Thee!” Our rest—whose rest? This Sabbath—what Sabbath? At such moments, certain words of John Ruskin ring in my ears, in a manner and with a rebuke indescribable—words that fill me with deep earnestness. “If there is anything that God abhors,” says Ruskin somewhere, “it is that we ask of him aught we really do not want.” Now, we pray, “Grant that our rest on this Sabbath be acceptable to Thee.” Do we really want such rest? How many among all the Jews that form the membership of our congregations really want to rest on the seventh day? How many make a genuine effort to rest on that day? For whom, then, are we praying?

Moreover, there is another, more serious point to be considered, Mr. President, in your annual message to which we all listened with pleasure the other night, one statement struck me with particular force. It is where you express your belief that our religious questions should be interpreted in the light not of the past but of the present. Now, I beg leave to disagree with you. I believe that the day is past for the reading of the problems of Judaism in the light of the present. That was the task of the last generation, of the pioneers of Reform Judaism—to bring forward the claims

of the present as against the past, of to-day as against yesterday. But our duty at present, it appears to me, is to advance. It is to read our religious difficulties, to endeavor to solve our problems, not in the light of the past, nor solely in the light of the present, but rather in the light of the future. The spiritual welfare of our children should command our attention and illumine our efforts. Now, if I had any expectation whatsoever that in the course of time conditions in Western life would so change, or that some day or other, Israel, as our Orthodox and Zionist brethren believe, would be redeemed and go back to a land of his own, then I would say: "Let us wait, let us endure the present condition, let us cling to the present anemic institution for the sake of the future." But no such thing is possible. On the one hand, we are no Zionists. On the other, there is no hope of conditions—economic, industrial, social—ever changing in our land. If there is any hope at all, it is that toward the occidental mode of life we shall incline more and more. The longer we wait, the more our children will drift away from our old institutions and habits. Our responsibility toward the future and toward the children whom we are called upon to teach is very great, and we dare not ignore it. At present we can hardly teach our children to observe the Sabbath. They may naturally ask, What is the Sabbath? Which is our Sabbath? The day on which our fathers are employed at the offices, stores, factories; on which our mothers do their shopping—is that the Sabbath? A Sabbath without rest is no Sabbath.

Again, Dr. Voorsanger, I suggest, might have indicated that rest is vitally connected with the Biblical idea of the Sabbath, though the interpretation of the cause of the institution has varied. We all know that the view of the Decalogue in *Exodus* varies from that in *Deuteronomy*. I will emphasize this, because it shows conclusively that among our forefathers the day of rest was the chief concern, even though the theologic notions underlying it kept on changing. The Sabbath is accounted for in the Decalogue in the Book of *Exodus* on the ground that the Almighty rested on the seventh day after His labors, while in *Deuteronomy* it is regarded as a token of the deliverance from Egypt and as an injunction to humanitarian treatment of the laborer, of man and beast.

I do not believe that the ancient law-givers ever demanded false observance of the day. I do not believe that a single prophet or master ever was satisfied with that sort of observance of any holiday. Does not the condemnation that Isaiah hurled against the hypocritic Sabbath ring in your ears? It was that divine prophet who warned his people against the iniquitous Sabbath, which was an abomination to God. The same way I feel in regard to our Sabbath I say that it is untrue, unholy, a mere form; therefore, it must be an abomination to God.

I will not reiterate, for the sake of completing the argument, the fact advanced already by Dr. Deutsch that by transferring our Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday we shall not be making any concessions to the Christians. However, I may be allowed to add that a study of the Christian Sunday must convince everybody that not only the Catholic Church, but also all great Protestant leaders, such as Luther and Calvin and Knox, have been always anxious to insist that Sunday was by no means a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, a fulfilment of the Fourth Commandment, but rather a distinct Christian institution. None would confuse the Jewish Sabbath with the Christian Sunday—none familiar with the spirit of both institutions.

To sum up: Saturday is our so-called day of rest and worship, but in actuality it is no Sabbath. Sunday is, under the present circumstances, our real day of rest. The question now is: Shall we have an official worship without the day of rest, or shall we have the day of rest with worship?

LOUIS WOLSEY: Like the writer of the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm, "I am young and held in little esteem," nevertheless I shall speak upon the floor of the Conference if only to give myself that inner satisfaction that comes from having performed the sacred duty of giving expression to something which one feels deeply. I cannot but feel how extraordinarily appropriate was the comparison that Brother Sonneschein made between the Sabbath and his aching front tooth. I presume that dentist in San Francisco filled his tooth with gold. And that is what the Saturday Sabbath is—a day filled with the

pursuit after gold. Even he bargained about his Sabbath: "If I cannot give my God one hundred per cent., I will give Him ten per cent."

Dr. Voorsanger very strongly emphasizes this character of our seventh-day Sabbath. It is a day whose non-observance is mainly due to present industrial conditions. And the learned paper gave us the impression that if any solution to our difficulties is possible, it is in a reconciliation of the Sabbath with modern industrialism. But, my brothers, I insist that that is not the problem before us. It is not a reconciling of the Sabbath with material conditions; it is a reconciling of the Sabbath with rabbinical conditions. Your retention of the Saturday as the Sabbath is founded solely upon the authority of history, while the whole tendency in Judaism to-day, as I read it, is a breaking away from authority. You are not consulting the past when you form your opinions in religious matters; you are consulting your reason. Even your Bible that you claim as your religious authority, is your authority only when it coincides with your reason. You reject those parts with which your reason dissents. Did not Dr. Moses say to you this morning: "Let us not go back to the origin; let us not go back to the past; let us rather consider the present."

Dr. Voorsanger after propounding a few questions, said: "We have now cleared the ground for action." I must express a sense of disappointment that, though the field was cleared, there was no action. His questions were suggestive, but they left us with the old doubts, and gave us no definite plan. One of his queries was whether the transference from Saturday to Sunday would be a break with history. Most decidedly would it be a break with history. But is not your whole present-day Judaism a break with history? And, therefore, to still maintain an historical Sabbath is inconsistent with your whole attitude towards Judaism. Therefore you have no peace, no harmony in your religion. What is your Friday night Sabbath? It is nothing but an opportunist movement, to avoid a Sunday transference. I do not say this because the condition of my Friday night attendance might lead you to think that my position is based upon "sour grapes." I am satisfied with my congregation on that Friday night. My attendance

is such as to justify me in a feeling of pride. But I feel that in retaining this Saturday Sabbath I have compromised my reason, that I have been inconsistent in my religion. If our religion is a religion of reason then let us not hedge and beat about the bush. Like Dr. Enelow, I should feel like a hypocrite were I to utter the words of our prayer: "May our rest be acceptable unto Thee." I introduce the word "worship" instead of the word "rest"; whereas I feel that while I have been consistent with the spirit of our present day Sabbath, I have perverted the whole intention of the Jewish Sabbath. Sabbath means rest and because there is a possibility of a Jewish rest only on Sunday, do I come out flat-footed for a Sunday Sabbath.

You may think that I am very radical in my sentiments concerning the Sabbath movement. Nevertheless I am conservative by nature, and I would strongly prefer to retain the seventh day Sabbath. But in doing so, I want a Sabbath that is a Sabbath; I do not want one for women and children and rabbis. I want a Sabbath for all Jews, a Sabbath consistent with Judaism. But in my whole position I am not a "Separatist." Majority rule shall govern me in my actions. I shall never oppose the general sense of this Conference.

My whole position then, is this: If Sabbath means rest, let us have that Sabbath on Sunday for that is the only day when modern business conditions will allow a rest. Secondly, if you wish to be logical in your Judaism; if you wish to consult your reason in so far as the whole progressive tendency of this Conference is vested in its being logical—you must, you should accept the Sunday Sabbath.

M. HELLER: This conference would have been a greater success if the whole time had been spent on this subject, which would have eventually shown a unanimity of view in spite of apparent differences. It is the future to which we have to look, and we do wrong to judge the Jewish problem of to-day in the light of the last fifty years, instead of the last three thousand. The difference between Occidentalism and Orientalism is not one between progress and retrogression.

The difference is between a hurried and a calm and meditative life. There has been a retrogression into barbarism under the banners of enlightenment. I take decided exception to that part of the paper which spoke of material progress as an argument for a change, and favor adherence to the Sabbath whether or not the Christians would concede the right to work on Sunday. The Jew has been most lax in maintaining the right to work on that day. There are many Jews who are willing to remain poor, so long as they can keep the Sabbath. If there was this heroism among all Jews they could make the contract to work five days in the week, and becoming martyrs to that they would not in the end suffer, but if they should, it need not matter. It is impossible to sacrifice the principles of the Jews, and they can not have a perfect Sabbath until they are a nation. Zangwill is right—either submergence or emergence.

We must try to save the fragments of the Sabbath until the time of a better day when we can return to the grand old times and have a real Sabbath once more. The Jews will finally realize that their salvation lies in standing together for their principles.

HENRY COHEN: I am for Saturday Sabbath, but this discussion is quite valid, inasmuch as we are all working for one end. Sunday addresses and Sunday gatherings even in a synagogue can do no harm, and may be productive of some permanent good. But it appears to me that we cannot reconcile the sanctification of the first day instead of the seventh, with the fourth commandment. How are we to explain to our children that, because it is not convenient for the large majority of our people to hallow the Sabbath, we have abrogated it, without weakening their sense of religious responsibility altogether? As I understand Dr. Voorsanger's paper it is a plea for the better observance of the Sabbath. Let us then suggest to our congregations, in the light of our present day surroundings and circumstances, how best to sanctify the day so as to conform with the spirit of the Pentateuchal law. We, as Jews, can never substitute another for the traditional day. The very attempt would fail. Sunday for a hundred reasons could never be to us a Sabbath, such as Saturday is.

JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF: Before I say a single word or argue the subject before us, permit me to say that I extend to Dr. Voorsanger of San Francisco, my heartiest thanks. Others have spoken before me of the paper presented by him, but I doubt whether any of them can thank him more heartily than I do. To Dr. Voorsanger has been assigned the paper on the question of the Saturday Sabbath against the Sunday Sabbath. I might have expected fair treatment on the part of Dr. Voorsanger. I have known him for many years. I have known him to be an able man—a fair, just man—yet I might have been disappointed in my expectations. Other men have been fair, upright and just, until they came to the Sabbath question, when they suddenly became unjust, unfair, unreasonable. I have suffered considerably by reason of such unfairness.

Ladies and gentlemen, permit me to say that I am a Sunday service man and that I am proud to be one. I wish, at the same time, to say that I am a Saturday service man, and equally as proud of that. I am a Saturday service man twelve months in the year, in addition to being a Sunday service man seven months in the year.

I have risen with considerable hesitancy to speak this afternoon. And if I had not been strongly urged by a number of colleagues, I would not have opened my mouth on this question, because, for me it is a delicate subject. I cannot speak on this question unless I speak from personal experience. If I do so, it may seem egotistical, it may seem almost as a reflection on other men, others present here. I have grown almost old in the Sunday service. We completed our fifteenth season of Sunday services the last week of the past month. I have had ample time to study the question. I believe I know whereof I speak, when I say that the attitude for or against the Sunday Sabbath is a constitutional one rather than a religious. Habit or inheritance or innate or acquired prejudice play a larger part in this question than reason. I see before me able men—I see before me lovers of the cause of Judaism. I see they are as radically opposed to the Sunday service, as I am in favor of it, therefore, I have come to the conclusion that there ought to be no incriminations nor recriminations. Some see it from one point of view, some from another point of view. It is my pleasure to be able to say to you that, notwithstanding our Sunday service, our

congregation has a larger Sabbath attendance than many of our other congregations, not excepting those presided over by graduates of the Theological Seminary of New York. I am, in addition, also a Sunday service man, first of all, because I am a Jew; secondly, because I love Judaism, and I love both with all my heart; thirdly, because on the 11th day of July, 1883, Rev. Dr. Wise placed his hand on my head and said: "Go forth, preach Judaism, preach it to Jew and Gentile, make Israel proud of the glories of his race, and of his precious heritage." And when I entered upon my work, and witnessed the Saturday Sabbath hypocrisy, I became ashamed of what I saw paraded as the Jewish Sabbath. To repeat the words of Dr. Enelow, "I saw farce and hypocrisy in my Temple." I desired to be honest; I could not face the children of my Sabbath school, and teach them to keep the seventh day holy, when their fathers and brothers, their mothers and sisters desecrated it. I was tired of having mere Saturday Kaddish Jews.

Clearly I recognized the obstacles that would in our country forever interfere with a restful and devotional Saturday Sabbath, that would forever prevent Judaism being taught and preached to large audiences of Jews and Gentiles on the busy and intensely materialistic Saturday.

I came to the conclusion that I must have Sunday services in addition to my Sabbath services.

I went to Philadelphia, and entered the very hot-bed of Orthodoxy—I found a lamentable state of affairs with regards to the Sabbath—all profession, but very little practice. I found an ethical society there making successful propaganda among the Jewish youth of Philadelphia, and I came to the conclusion that, inasmuch as a late Friday evening service, owing to the great distances of the people's residences from the temple, and owing to other local conditions, had proven a failure, there was no other alternative than the Sunday service, if I would have my people attend services regularly week after week—at least from October to the end of April—if I would preach Judaism to a temple crowded with people instead of one of comparative emptiness.

As I opened my doors wide on Sunday, what I had believed came to pass. The people crowded to the temple, so much so, that it ha

to be enlarged twice, so much so, that we had to build a new temple with twice the seating capacity of the former. We have continued in that way from year to year. We have built up a powerful congregation—and all by reason of the Sunday service.

Gentlemen, permit me to say also this, by reason of the Sunday service, our Sabbath service has grown stronger and stronger, and we have to-day, probably the best attended Saturday service of any of the up-town Jewish congregations in the City of Philadelphia. I see them come—husband, wife, brother and sister, son and daughter—all entering heartily into the spirit of worship and anxious to be taught the truths of Judaism, and to assist in their being spread. Such being the facts of the case, who dare say, because we have introduced Sunday services, that we have become less loyal Jews. Let me tell you, gentlemen, that you can keep your Sabbath, unharmed, by opening your temple doors for worship and instruction also on Sunday. The charges made by Dr. Lewinthal: "That when you open your temple on Sunday, you will close it on Saturday," are unfounded. There is but a single Sunday service rabbi who closed his temple on Saturday. But that was due to his own desire in the matter. He could easily have a fairly well attended Saturday service, besides a crowded Sunday service, if he so desired.

T. SCHANFARBER: Almost every one of the members of this Conference who has thus far spoken on this important question touching the life of Judaism has urged that measures be instituted to rehabilitate the traditional Sabbath, but they have failed to go into detail and state what these measures should be. This, perhaps, because they are at a loss what to suggest as the best means and methods of infusing new life into the Sabbath. We must never forget that we are facing a condition and not a theory. In many of the smaller communities of this country, the Saturday morning service has been dispensed with, owing to the meagre numbers that attend. What the larger cities will be forced to do in another score of years, who can tell. There is not a rabbi in the entire country—not even the most radical of them all—who would not prefer the old Sabbath, hallowed

by so many memories and with which the entire history of Israel is bound up—if it could be restored in its pristine glory. But the question that we must face fairly and squarely is, "Can it be restored?" Conditions do not warrant an affirmative reply. Under these circumstances there certainly ought to be no opposition to the introduction of a supplementary Sunday service in such congregations where the need of such a service is felt. We must give our people an opportunity to attend services at a time when they can come. If we want them to learn something about their literature, their history, their religion, closing the doors against them on a day when they are free to come to the House of God, is a poor way of bringing about this result. Then I believe that we have a duty to the world also. We constantly speak about our mission, but we are using very poor means to teach mankind what our mission is, or what the message is which Israel proclaims. A supplementary Sunday service may open the way toward bringing our thought to the non-Jew. If we are ever going to realize the prophet Isaiah's announcement—that of becoming a "light unto the nations" we must cease our *laissez faire* attitude in regard to this matter and do something tangible along these lines. We should retain the traditional Sabbath for those who still desire to worship on that day, but we should not prevent the spread of the light of our truth by opposing the introduction of a Sunday service alongside of the Saturday service where the demand for such a service is made.

ADOLPH GUTTMACHER : To my mind the modern attitude toward the Bible has much to do with the non-observance of the historical Jewish Sabbath. I recall the advice given me during the first year of my ministry by a friend after I had delivered a sermon on the Miracles of the Bible. I endeavored to show that belief in miracles was not essential to Judaism, that we could be a Jew and need not believe in a single miracle. "Don't tell people what they need not believe, tell them rather what they should believe. To tell people not to believe in miracles, is like carrying coal to Newcastle." This was the sound advice of my friend!

Ever since I have heeded this advice. I deem it a mistake to

drag Biblical criticism into the pulpit. But the pulpit, in its desire to establish a reputation for modern scholarship, has given to the Jew the results of Modern Criticism, that, by no means, have been thoroughly tested and established as facts. The Jew is unable to grasp the conclusions of modern scholarship. The subject is too difficult. That "a little learning is a dangerous thing" the attitude of pulpit and Jew has abundantly proven. Modern theories have discredited the historical Sabbath in the minds of the laymen; the ground for its observance has been gradually cut away from under it.

I take issue with the gentleman from Louisville, who asserted that the Jew, were economical conditions different from what they are, would not attend the House of God on the Sabbath, for the Jew is too materialistic. I know that, whenever one of our holy days comes on a Sunday the places of worship are everywhere crowded, and that would be the case should Saturday be legalized by the laws of our country as a day of rest.

The gentleman from New Orleans takes a too pessimistic view of modern civilization when he asks the Jew not to identify himself with it. Civilization is gauged not by the lowest, but by the highest and noblest aspirations. There may be, and there is, much in our present civilization that meets with our disapproval, but there is infinitely much that makes for higher and nobler manhood. Let the Jew identify himself with the best thought of the age; let the Jew, instead of being a follower, become a leader.

His religion will furnish him with more than sufficient material to become a light unto the world!

JOSEPH HERZ: When I read that the observance of the Sabbath would be one of the discussions to come before the Conference, I felt it my duty to come here and was glad to find that the almost entire sentiment of the Conference was opposed to a transfer of the Sabbath of the Decalogue to the first day of the week.

But it appears to me that no practical proposition has been made to rehabilitate the Sabbath. It seems to me that such can only be done by the introduction of the sanctification of the Sabbath within the circle of the family.

There is, perhaps, no minister who has not, at some time or other, appealed to the female members of his congregation to sanctify the Sabbath within their homes. This appeal would be of greater weight were the Central Conference of American Rabbis to second the appeal.

The Kiddush service within the home would, I think, be one of the means to sanctify the Sabbath. The consequence would be a more general attendance at the places of worship.

There is in existence a revised version of the Kiddush by Dr. Berkowitz. Cannot this Kiddush be printed in the form of leaflets, and be sent to Jewish families, or better to the mothers in Israel, for it is they who keep alive the spark of religion among the Jews? Without their piety, their enthusiasm, Judaism would soon cease to exist.

G. DEUTSCH : If what the speaker has said simply means that the Sabbath as a day of rest can be re-inforced—and we want it to be kept as a day of worship—I shall leave it to others more experienced in congregational affairs to decide what can be done in this matter. I wish to take issue with the speaker on scientific grounds. Sunday as a day of resurrection is a mistaken conception.

We must add, that Sunday is not a Christian Sabbath; a Christian Sabbath cannot exist. Christianity meant uprooting of the law. The author of the Epistle to the Galatians says: "Ye observe days and months and times and years, I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain," which means, if any Christian observes the Sabbath or a holiday, he has ceased to be a Christian, he is a Jew still; therefore, Christianity had no Sabbath. This was in keeping with the general position as to Jewish national aspirations taken by the early Christians. The Jewish law is considered as the means of the preservation of a distinct Jewish nationality.

The Sabbath is one of those laws and, therefore, had no meaning to the Christians.

I hope that the Convention of New Orleans will do something to refute this widespread error.

It must further be emphasized that the Roman Catholic Church does

not conceive of the Sunday as a day of rest, but merely as a day of worship, and only for the sake of making attendance at worship possible, abstinence from labor is demanded. The Jewish position all through history is the opposite. No matter how the position has changed, with regard to details, the Sabbath of Judaism is always primarily, a day of rest, and only secondarily a day of worship. This can be proven by theological opinions as well as by the consciousness of the people; I appeal to everyone who knows Jewish life to say whether or not I am right. A village Jew who all the year round had no opportunity of religious worship, was not considered a bad Jew, he was merely considered an unfortunate man.

The Christian Sabbath was only started with the Puritans; it means an introduction of Jewish ideas into Christianity.

I may add something from our Jewish point of view which is not generally known. Among those who are not to share in the life to come are counted those who despise the holidays. This is an anti-Christian statement. I will further quote from one who is known as one of the strongest opponents of Christianity—a man who lived in the first half of the fourth century. It is Abahu who said "God rested from His work. What was God's work? God rested from speaking—so we have to rest and therefore even social talk is not permitted." The Jewish Sabbath as a day of strict rest was evidently not always practically enforced. Only so we can understand what the Talmud said "If Israel would observe one Sabbath, redemption would come at once. Christianity claims that the Messianic redemption was the abolition of the law. Judaism stated that the strict observance of the Sabbath would bring redemption. In the same sense are any number of passages to be interpreted. Therefore, the idea of Sunday must neither be advocated nor refuted, because it is the Christian Sabbath.

I. L. LEUCHT: Two or three days ago, a morning's paper did me the honor of forestalling my opinion on the Sabbath, or better, on the Sunday question.

To my great surprise, I was told that a schism exists in our city. That one rabbi still held to the Sabbath of the decalogue and

that the other was of the opinion that any day would do, so long as the people would assemble in the synagogue.

I will admit, that, in the very beginning of the agitation, I was of the opinion that a change to Sunday perhaps might be beneficial for the life of the Sabbath. It was often said that by having Sunday services, we would finally succeed in resurrecting that sacred spirit that animated our fathers and mothers. As far as Saturday is concerned, I want to ask you whether you think that that spirit of old will ever come again into the houses of our people? Before my mental vision there arises at this minute a vivid recollection of how the Sabbath was celebrated in my mother's home. It was about four o'clock, Friday afternoon, the house looked as if a great prince was about to arrive. My mother stretched forth her hands, lifted her eyes alight on high, and with uplifted hands said: "Blessed art Thou, O God, who has allowed us to kindle the Sabbath light." We went to the synagogue—we came back. We all know how the house looked on Friday evening. We would sing our songs—recite our prayers. The solemnity of the Sabbath pervaded the very atmosphere. On the other hand, permit me to describe to you the modern Sabbath. The man comes home tired and weary from the labor of the day. He hastens to take his meal. Impatiently the women of the house are waiting until the meal is taken. Then what happens? They go to the theatre! Do you think that the spirit of the true celebration of the Sabbath day will ever come back again? That father, mother and children will ever assemble on Friday eve around the festive board again as in times of yore? Will go to the synagogue? I deny that the time will ever come again to us. I deny that all the modern methods proposed will ever be able to resurrect the sacred spirit of old.

Gentlemen, it has been said on this floor that civilization is brutalizing us. I don't believe it. Civilization will always lead for righteousness, goodness, light and progress. I do believe that many things have to be done on the modern Sabbath that were not necessary in times gone by.

Do you believe that such sacred enthusiasm for the Sabbath will live again?

M. MESSING: I remember an incident in 1868. I dedicated a temple in Indianapolis. Dr. Wise was with me. We were talking about the Sabbath. There was even at that time a great discussion about the Sabbath just as there is to-day.

Dr. Wise said to me: "One thing is certain and that is, all Israelites to-day know that they do wrong but they cannot help themselves. Let us try our utmost to say all we can for the Sabbath and as much as we possibly can." I told him I had inaugurated Friday evening services. Thank God I have audiences every Friday evening. What you can teach them on Sunday, I teach them on Saturday. My congregation does not desire Sunday services. You can make them rest on Sunday but you cannot sanctify the Sunday—you can, at least, sanctify Friday night's Sabbath and teach the people the sanctity of the day.

JOSEPH SILVERMAN: What are we contending for? Are we contending for the Sabbath or are we contending for Judaism? There has been danger all along of making a fetish out of the Sabbath. We must reiterate it to-day, even if we take it from a book to which many do not subscribe that "Man was not made for the Sabbath, the Sabbath was made for man." We must not sacrifice man for the sake of the Sabbath. I do not say that we must sacrifice the Sabbath—we must *use* it for man—we must use it for the benefit of the Jew, for the benefit of his religion. In the light of that principle, all ceremonies and traditions connected with the Sabbath must be secondary. That principle once acknowledged makes our path plain. If we cannot, because of certain conditions, which have been well analyzed, bring our people to the synagogue on the Sabbath for the purpose of impressing upon them the principles of Judaism, then it becomes our duty to bring them to the synagogue when we can—when they will come for the sake of the great object which we have in view. It has been claimed that the institution of Sunday services, supplementary to the Sabbath services, for the purpose merely of teaching Judaism at such a time when the people at large are at leisure, would be detrimental to the life of our faith.

It is contended that this institution has detracted from the Sabbath. I claim that the institution of a late Friday night's

service does more harm to the Sabbath, than the institution of Sunday services, Sunday lectures, because by some peculiar reasoning people believe that if they attend synagogue for thirty minutes Friday evening, they are then keeping the Sabbath—while those who attend on Sunday, do not attend with the idea that by their worship and by their presence, they are keeping the Sabbath at all. They attend merely for prayer and instruction.

The Jewish Sabbath, according to tradition, begins at sundown and lasts until sundown. Orthodox Jews must deny the right to institute late Friday night services. Those who institute Sunday services, can put forth the claim that they are really extending the Sabbath from Friday night, sundown, until Sunday, noon.

We in Temple Emanu-El receive the Sabbath Bride with all dignity, on Friday at sundown, with elaborate songs and prayers. On Saturday morning, we have another service in the traditional form, though somewhat modified. In addition to these two services, which are well attended, we have services on Sunday morning. Thus we give three opportunities to the people to worship God, and to learn their duties. Our experience in Temple Emanu-El has been that Sunday services, far from detracting from Sabbath attendance, have aroused many Jews from their lethargy and indifference and held those to the faith who, without an opportunity to worship when they could, would have become alienated from Israel.

W. WILLNER: I wish to inform a previous speaker that, while the remark that the Sabbath is made for man and not man for the Sabbath is in the New Testament, it is in reality there only copied from a Mekhilta, "the Sabbath is delivered to you, and not you are delivered into the hands of it." In the old Sabbath service, too much stress is often laid on the introductory clause of how glad Moses was, or ought to be, of his mission. Emphasis should rather be laid on the important clause: "And purify our hearts to serve Thee in truth." Now the Hebrew word Avodah does not originally mean sacrificial rite, or what now is called "Services," but it means action, active or contemplative service such as a servant performs for his master.

The Sabbath never was a day of worship purely, it was a day of rest with incidental worship. I am perfectly frank with my people

and tell them that attendance in synagogue is not absolutely necessary, if they but pray at home—but since they do not do so, it is better for them to come. But while we rest, far be it from us to say that it ever was the idea of any Jew that God worked six days and then became too tired to continue and rested. Not even the Shiur Komah with all its crass anthropomorphisms says—heaven forbid—that God was tired.

Rest must be sacred. Not in the synagogue, but in the homes was the real sanctification, the kiddush of the Sabbath. Who does not keep the Sabbath, keeps not the Sunday—he may rest, but he has not the especial joy of the true Jewish Sabbath.

And in fine, may we indeed “recognize and know that our rest comes from God, and by their rest sanctify His name.”

S. H. SONNESCHEIN: The Sabbath is not dying. There are some painful symptoms of decay—but the doctor is an alarmist, who frightens the patient rather than encourage him. I went once in my life to a dentist, having had a terrible toothache. That was about nine years ago. The good man wanted to draw the tooth. I protested and, thanks to my good star, I have this, my tooth, yet.

Now as to our *Sabbath*. This most sacred day suffers only from neglect, but its root is still intact and the nerve sound to the core. The root of the Sabbath is not the mistaken dogma, that because God rested on the seventh day, we His children must do as He did. God, the Eternal Creator, never rests! The most Orthodox daily prayer, certainly an unimpeachable authority, gives utterance to this in unmistakable terms, when it says: “God renews perpetually every day the work of creation.” So much for the shelving of a semi-idolatrous dogma. The fact is that the classic Talmud finds no profanation of the Sabbath in certain kinds of the most laborious and most tiresome exertion of my working hands. Should I on a hot Sabbath afternoon find it necessary to remove my library from the ground floor to the upper story of my house and for two hours or more, in the sweat of my brow work like a pack-horse in carrying with bent shoulders and slow, heavy tread hundreds of volumes from place to place, I could not be accused of being a Sabbath breaker. The main principle is the abstinence

from productive labor. And inasmuch as we, in our modern, economical and industrial surroundings and conditions do in the smallest, as well as in the widest activities, rely on help and are an indispensable part of the incessantly moving machinery of a nation's production and consumption, we had no other choice than to follow the trend of the clog wheels of mart and trade. And if such an irresistible pressure allows the Jew only a small part of the Sabbath rest, and he has no more time than a couple of hours to dedicate to worship and the higher aspiration of the soul, then, even then, Heaven will generously accept the prayer: "Receive with Divine mercy and grace our brief spell of spiritual recreation."

And as to doing business on the seventh day, Sabbath. I would advise my brethren to look carefully in the 255th chapter of the *Orach Chayim* and read what the greatest rabbinical authority of the sixteenth century, the Gaon Moses Karo, has to say on the subject of partnership in a store which is kept by a Jew and non-Jew, and they will at once find a safe key for unlocking the chain of difficulty. If you, Brother President, would appoint me on a committee, which shall give its thoroughly digested opinion on the Sabbath problem, I will gladly serve and help in this matter of clearing and paving a way out of all difficulties.

CLOSING REMARKS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.

JACOB VOORSANGER: I shall not detain this Conference with any lengthy discussion. I would like to say introductorily to whatever remarks I may have to present, that the memorable German Conferences of 1845, 1846 and 1847, discussed this Sabbath question in a far more exhaustive manner than, with the time at our disposal, we could possibly do. The report of the first commission, appointed by the Conference of 1845, which presented its report the following year at Breslau, shows that the question was studied and discussed by men whose names have become famous in the American ministry. I may mention Sam'l Hirsch, Sam'l Adler and David Einhorn, in addition to that remarkable man, whose words I quoted to you in opening this discussion, and I must particularly call your attention to one sentence in that quotation, namely that "while it will

be impossible for this Conference to come to any practical conclusion, discussion may be the means of fixing certain principles, as a part of the practice of our people."

I must express my regret, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion on this question has taken a rather curious turn. Speaking for myself, I must confess, I am not at all interested in the question whether any particular congregation holds Friday evening or Saturday evening services. For all I am concerned, services may be held at midnight, if people are pleased to engage in devotion at that hour. We have an orthodox minister in San Francisco who is more liberal than I can pretend to be. He holds Sunday evening services and lectures to his people at that time, which goes to show that the selection of any particular time for service and instruction, is purely a matter of local policy and nothing else. In a careful study of the spiritual interest of our people, we discover as a matter of fact, without the necessity of presenting such a fact before this Conference, that the interest of our people in various localities cannot be judged by the same standard, hence that we must be governed by local considerations.

I never was, and I am not now, in favor of a Sunday Sabbath, that is to say, in favor of the transfer of the principles underlying the seventh day observance to any other day, whether it be Sunday or Monday, but I cannot say at the same time that I am opposed to instruction or service on any day besides the Sabbath, no matter how much that might be misinterpreted by people who habitually misconstrue anything we do or suggest. But my personal experience is that once upon a time some of my people asked for Sunday lectures, and with my usual readiness to oblige them I prepared a course of lectures. The result was that every man who demanded those Sunday lectures never showed his face, and I reluctantly came to the conclusion that the movement had its inspiration in sheer love of imitation. Sunday lectures had been instituted elsewhere, but the experience proved that there was no necessity for them in San Francisco, and, after fifteen lectures, the experiment was not repeated.

Brethren of the Conference, may I again call your attention to this particular fact, that the discussion has taken an unlooked-for turn. Whilst I thank you most heartily for the commendation you

have been pleased to bestow upon this paper of mine, let me remind you that I have tried to fix in your minds a few principles, which should have been discussed. The question of Sunday Sabbath, or Saturday Sabbath, was not and is not now under discussion, and I am not at all interested in the personal opinion of some of the brethren regarding the transfer of the Sabbath, which, as I have stated in my paper, is altogether foreign to the functions and the mission of this Conference, but I do want to know what you are able to do to revitalize the Sabbath and make it again an integral portion in the religious life of our people. That question you have not answered. That you seem to be willing to leave to me. You come here with an account of personal experiences, but you are not presenting to the world any fixed opinion as regards that unfortunate incongruity that I have placed before you, an incongruity that presents us as a community of Sabbath breakers who theoretically uphold the Sabbath. Come down from the clouds, gentlemen, stay with the facts, and please do not avoid the facts. Be physicians. Be like those healers of man, who are not afraid of facing the issues involved in dangerous diseases. Action, and not talk, is needed at this important time. Bide then with me a moment longer to discuss the facts that I have placed before you, provided you are willing to admit that they are facts.

I have submitted three propositions for your consideration. In the first place, I said to you that you must tell me whether you believe the decline of religious authority to be one of the reasons for the decadence of the Sabbath. I have asked you to say whether there is not a difference between a Sabbath that is a mere expression of social order, and a Sabbath that is the pledge of a Divine authority. And I have asked you to say whether there is not in the teachings of the times an element so radical, so conservative of authority, that it endangers the popular belief in the integrity of religious institutions, including the Sabbath. Next I said to you, that there are economic reasons why our people do not keep the Sabbath, and you must say to me whether, in a statement of these facts and reasons, I have been right or wrong. You must not give me personal experiences that bear no relation to these main questions. Thirdly, I contended that the social environments

of our people, at least in these United States, do not encourage the perpetuation of old time sentiment, and that no matter how beautiful were the functions of introducing, and observing, the Sabbath, in olden times, as Brother Leucht has eloquently told us, these same sentiments cannot prevail, for they have died out, and the difference in social environment is responsible for it. Now, having stated these three propositions, I want to refer for a moment to the *Daily Picayune*, to remove an impression created by its publication of my paper. Public opinion has been called to the incongruity of that document. It is said that I made an argument in favor of Sunday Sabbath. I desire to emphasize that my paper never dealt with the Sunday Sabbath, that I merely stated the reasons why the Sabbath is not kept, but I never said that these reasons constituted a valid argument in favor of Sunday Sabbath. At the conclusion of my paper, I intimated that so far as finding redress against Sabbath breaking is concerned, I was as much at sea as anybody else. But even though I have admitted that the Sabbath is in danger, I cannot, as complacently as others, pronounce the final doom upon that time-honored institution. Do you suppose it is such an easy thing to throw a three-thousand-year tradition overboard? Do you think it is so easy a matter for one, imbued with the traditions of his people, to alienate himself from them, or to recommend something that, in his personal opinion, would slowly but surely alienate him and his children from Judaism? This paper was intended neither as an argument for Sunday Sabbath nor as an apology for Sabbath breaking, but it was intended to present the naked truth regarding the status of the Sabbath in the United States, and to show the American Rabbinate that we are between the upper and the nether millstone. Our position is just at present that, on the one hand, our Sabbath is being killed by non-observance, and that, on the other, we do not want another Sabbath. It is no compliment, after all, to say to a man that he had the courage to tell the truth, nor is it any compliment to congratulate a man upon his conservatism, if so that conservatism means the dishonesty of suppressing facts. I am free to say to those, who advocate a departure from Saturday to Sunday, rather than have no Sabbath at all, that whilst I concede to them the honesty of their opinions, that I have no courage at the present

time to agree to the justice of their proposition. And I need not apologize to anyone for the fact that historical principles and traditions clamor within me for recognition, that Faith and Tradition, aside from all and any theological propositions, are dear to me. That I dread the danger of alienation, because, so long as there is one poor Jew in the world, I want to be a Jew with him. This is not merely a question of theology, and assuredly not a question of expediency. It is a question of principle. It is a question of the logic of events, a question of sympathetic attitude towards maintaining the integrity of historical institutions, a question of the fraternity of Israel, remaining intact for all the future. You must answer, and you have not yet done it, whether you wish to take up these three propositions of mine, because in such grave matters as are involved by them, no man dare be his own authority. Whatever suggestions I had to offer, or may have to offer in the future, should be approved or rejected by the consensus of my brethren. I ask you to consider whether you know of any authority by which the Jewish people, at the present time, can be guided. You know perfectly well that Judaism is not mere Unitarianism, that no matter how free it is, no matter how liberal the interpretation of its Rabbis, if you desire your people to remain faithful to the moiety of historical discipline that is left us, if you please, making that discipline responsive to the conditions of the times, that, in that case, we must lead them back to more positive ground than they occupy at present. There is no doubt that a great deal of scrutiny is being directed towards this Conference. Tens of thousands of people are anxious to know whether you have any means of disposing of this important question. Permit me an illustration of this fact. I beg to assure you that I did not come to this Conference without having closely studied the question. I have tried to follow the Talmudical maxim "Go abroad and see what the people have to say." I was anxious for the opinion of the laity. I have interviewed a number of ladies and gentlemen, whom I consider to be sincere advocates of Judaism, people who are not swayed by material impulses, whose life has proved them to be actively engaged in securing the happiness of their fellow men, and I have reasoned with them and discussed this Sabbath question with them in all its details.

THE BIBLE AND MODERN THOUGHT.

BY RABBI S. SALE, Ph.D., ST. LOUIS, MO.

Religion is the source of inspiration out of which have come every adornment and excellence of human life; it is the perennial fountain from which flow the propelling and uplifting forces and influences which have been and ever will be at work in human history.

The creative soul of man, the image of its maker, has been struggling through the ages for an ever higher expression of its divine original, and to this indwelling of God in man, we ascribe all his achievements in every province of human activity.

Religiously speaking, the history of mankind is the unfolding of the divine ideal **לא יראו ראת את אחרי ופני לא יראו**. It is in reviewing the past, and beholding the gradual and steady development of man, that we become convinced of the supreme intelligence and goodness that underlie all things. Standing within this **לקרם הצור** this coign of vantage, we may still get a glimpse of that sublimest of all revelations concerning the deity, which the prophet in Israel was the first to proclaim to the world, in these words of the Bible: "God is love and grace, mercy and truth."

The truths which this faith enfolds cannot be contained in a single book, nor confined to a single people. God is not dead, and his revelations have not ceased, and our own present, with its wonders of art and science, is an integral and organic part of that historical process, out of which have come the Biblical and postbiblical and, indeed, the great literatures of all ages. To my thinking there is no more discomfiting and soul-chilling faith than that of an intermittent and circumscribed revelation, shut up within certain so-called canonical books. It is true, we still find, and we believe mankind will ever find, the highest expression of the religious ideal in our own precious literature, but the value and authority of the truths which it contains, lie not in the assumption of orthodoxy,

that they were proclaimed in a miraculous or supernatural manner, but in the fact, that they accord with our reason and appeal to our sense of what is externally right and good. This is not an *exparte* statement, nor the contention of a special pleader, but the calm and deliberate opinion of such scientists as Thomas Huxley and Wm. K. Clifford. These men find, as we do, upon dispassionate research, that the prophets of ancient Israel sat at the well-springs of human nature and caught the highest inspirations of the soul in its musing and whispering, as it communed with the Eternal. This religion of our prophets has its sheet-anchor in the human heart; the sunlight of truth and the atmosphere of freedom are the elements of its being and the arts and sciences are the children of light and joy in which God has bathed the human soul. Let those who cling to crumbling creeds and paper popes cry out against the spreading light, we hail its coming with rapturous delight, for as it grows it drives away dark hatred and superstition and scatters in their stead the sunbeams of love and truth. You will readily understand that we no longer maintain the distinction, that was formerly made and is yet currently accepted, between sacred and secular, profane and inspired especially with regard to literature. All writings of ancient and modern times that make for the higher and better life, that tend to uplift and chasten, to purify and strengthen, deserve to be called sacred and inspired and to be made a part of the ever-growing Bible of mankind. The Bible, pre-eminently so-called, forms no exception to this canon of literary excellence and, indeed, its chief claim to the unique position, and the secret of its hold upon the love and reverence of civilized man, lie in the fact that it appeals to our moral nature and awakens our higher aspirations as no other literature has ever done before or since. It is in this spirit of respect and reverence for that which is imperishable in the literary treasures of our past, that I shall undertake to discuss before you, some of the traditional views about the Bible, which form the subject of what is called, "the higher criticism."

The main purpose of this paper is not to furnish a summary of the results obtained by the scientific study of the Bible, nor to vindicate them as against the old orthodox view, but

simply to show that the method pursued by the modern students is well founded upon the Bible itself and upon the later traditions of the Synagogue. It was once regarded as a sacrilege to question the authenticity and genuineness of the Biblical books, because it was believed that they had all been written down under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and partly, at least so far as the Pentateuch was concerned, by direct divine dictation. The belief that the Holy Spirit operated only till the canon of the Bible as we have it to-day was completed, is held only by the orthodox of all denominations. Wherever it prevails, it necessarily precludes the right of private judgment and makes the office of the historian and the critic impossible. In the Synagogue, this idea of a hard and fast revelation, of a fixed and unchangeable repository of divine truth, never struck such deep roots as it did in the Church, and even after the Pentateuch was regarded as the sole regulative of religious life, it was so construed and expanded as to make it a flexible medium, suited to the varying needs and demands of life. Every reader of the prophets must be profoundly impressed with the sublimity and universality of their religious ideals, and the complete absence from their writings of everything that tends to empty formalism, ritualism, ecclesiasticism and every kind of dogmatism. That this spirit of freedom and independence which was the precious legacy of the prophets, had not died out in the synagogue during all the centuries of dire distress, which followed the disruption of the national existence, even down to and beyond the birth of Christianity, every one who has but a cursory knowledge of the Talmud must know. The data which it has preserved for us concerning the formation of our present collection of biblical books, are the strongest evidence in proof of this statement. The exact date of the closing of the canon of the Bible cannot be fixed, although it may be assumed as approximately correct, that this important event took place about one hundred years before the Christian era. We know, however, from the Talmud, that even as late as the middle of the first pre-Christian century, doubts were expressed as to whether the canon of the Bible as it had been arranged for the use of the Synagogue of those days, should remain fixed and closed, or be reopened. It is established that Ben Sira

at one time formed a part of the canon and was afterwards rejected, and very probable, that all of the Sefarim Hizonim were likewise a part of the sacred library, until, for some good reason, they were declared apocryphal. We are told that our sages wanted to exclude Ecclesiastes, Canticles and the book of Esther, and the writings of Ezechiel would surely have suffered that fate, had it not been for Hananya ben Hizkiyahu, who succeeded in harmonizing its contradictions of the Thorah, to the satisfaction of the remonstrant sages. The fact that our forefathers who made the Bible, i. e., who collected the scattered remnants of Hebrew literature, selected its contents, embodying certain writings and rejecting others, is conclusive proof that even in their late day, the right of reason and independent judgment was not denied. They knew full well that the book of Ezechiel contained flat contradictions of certain portions of the Pentateuch, that Ecclesiastes was rather sceptical and irreligious throughout, but despite these inconsistencies and inequalities, they embodied them all in the same volume. If our ancestors of those days had believed in the doctrine of the plenary and literal inspiration of the books, which they compiled, or if they had been heresy-hunters, after the modern fashion, we should have had to regret the loss of many a precious morsel of our literature, fragmentary as it is. If it was not a heresy for those who compiled and edited the Scriptures, to incorporate into them contradictory passages, why should we be held to accept certain traditional views concerning the authorship and authenticity of the various portions thereof, when they are not borne out by the writings themselves, and were not promulgated nor accepted until long after the times in which the real authors lived. If, instead of looking at the Bible through the spectacles of orthodox theology, men had read it in its own light, it would never have been set up as an infallible canon, nor have been arrayed against free and independent scientific research. I propose to show the truth of this statement by a few passages of the Bible itself.

The opening chapter of Genesis, properly understood, is but an attempt of some devout and eager mind to explain to himself and his contemporaries, with the lights at his command, how this wonderful world came into

being, and as such, it is certainly deserving of the foremost rank among all ancient cosmogonies. Now even though the author of this account of the creation may have believed it to be true, and may have attached to it a very high or even an absolute scientific value, there is nothing in it, which indicates, that he intended thereby to forestall or hinder all further thought and research on the same subject, or would have condemned any divergent accounts as heretical or irreligious. It is very probable that neither the writer himself, nor the editors of the Bible, intended his work to be a manual of exact science, but rather as a religious and moral stimulus, as an incentive to a higher and better life. The emphasis of the words, "and God saw that it was good," and the rounding off of the whole narrative with the reenforced insistence "and God saw all that he had made, and behold it was very good," seem to justify the inference that the author was more concerned about the fact that the world was made good, than about the accuracy of his statements, as to how the order of creation proceeded. In matchless beauty and simplicity this chapter sets forth the purpose and purport of Israel's religion. When chaos reigned supreme and darkness covered the deep, the creative word was heard, "let there be light." And as the magic word rang through nature's realm, out of confusion came cosmos, a world of order and of beauty out of the dreary waste and darkness. It matters little to us, whether the narrative meet the approval of the learned or not, and I for one am willing to grant it hopelessly wrong and irreconcilable with the results of natural science; still the truths which it enfolds are such as science can neither displace nor disprove, and which despite the wondrous strides we have made, are just as important and indispensable to mankind in its upward striving, as on the day when they were first proclaimed. Over the portal which leads to the sanctuary of Israel's faith, is written in characters that cannot be effaced, the truth which has been the hope and stay of the human race, the source of all its bliss and inspiration, the truth that there is a central light in the universe, a power resident in the world of matter, that worketh with wisdom and purposive intelligence the order and harmony of the world, and which has shed abroad in the human heart, the creative spark, the

divine image, which some day shall make this earth aglow with the warmth and radiance of justice, righteousness and loving kindness. I repeat, aside from any scientific value which the writer of this portion of Genesis may have attached to it, it was his evident purpose to teach that the world was made good. Since man, in his opinion, was fashioned in the likeness of that power which is manifest in the work of creation, the only aim and purpose of his life must be to realize the good. In the accomplishment of this, his evident destiny, man is hindered, neither by cruel fate nor a conspiracy of the powers of nature, that are superior to his God-given faculties. According to this faith of our fathers the world is so ordered, and all of its parts so nicely adjusted, that no power on earth can foil the divine efforts of man to make of this world a home of the good and true, the abode of righteousness and justice. A mere tyro in paleontology can disprove the statements of fact contained in Genesis, but what extent of knowledge and what keen scientific criticism can ever overturn the exalted principles of faith which it embodies? It was again no less an authority in science than Thomas Huxley who said: "In the 8th century B. C., in the heart of a world of idolatrous polytheists, the Hebrew prophets put forth a conception of religion, which appears to me to be as wonderful an inspiration of genius, as the art of Pheidias or the science of Aristotle. It is contained in these words of Micah: what does the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." If any so-called religion, says Huxley, takes away from this great saying of Micah, I think it wantonly mutilates, while if it adds thereto, I think it obscures the perfect ideal of religion. It was clearly the object of the writer of Genesis, of whom we have been speaking, to inculcate this high ideal of religion, and if his work has ever been misused to bar the progress of enlightenment, this fault must be laid to the shortsighted and narrow-minded dogmatism of those who misunderstood it. How the Bible was actually abused and distorted by blind literalists must be evident from the second chapter of Genesis, in which, beginning with the fourth verse, we have an account of the creation totally at variance with that of the first chapter. The order of creation in both narratives is entirely reversed and no matter how

we may strive to harmonize them, the fact stands, that they contradict each other in essential points. If the second account were not in the Bible, we may be assured that theologians of the strict type would denounce it as the rankest heresy, and if its author were alive to-day, he would certainly be read out of the orthodox fold. This fact, that the two accounts are flatly contradictory of each other, certainly makes for our assertion, that neither their authors nor the later compilers ascribed to them the character of infallible revelations, and it justifies the additional conclusion, that the men who wrote the Bible entertained widely divergent views on important topics, without becoming liable to the charge of heresy.

Again there are two versions of the decalogue in the Pentateuch, one in the second and the other in the fifth book. Comparing these two texts with each other, we find them so similar as to justify the conclusion that they must have been patterned after the same original but they differ from one another so materially in one essential point, as to force upon the unbiased student the inference that the divergence was intentional. According to Exodus, the Sabbath was instituted as a memorial of the creation of the world in six days, whereas in Deuteronomy the purpose of its establishment is given in these words: "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou and thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, * * * therefore the Eternal, thy God, commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Here there is no mention of the creation of the world, and we can hardly escape the inference that the writer of Deuteronomy was either unacquainted with the narrative of Genesis, a view generally accepted by Bible critics, or that he consciously departs from the writer of Genesis, in assigning a reason for the institution of the Sabbath. If, however, according to some modern critics Deuteronomy is older than the narrative in Genesis, the reasoning must be reversed. In any event, if the Bible had anciently been regarded as being literally and plenary true and inspired, as was asserted by later orthodoxy, it must be self-evident to those who are capable of thought, that either the one or the other reason would have been suppressed and that these accounts and all others in the Bible

which are contradictory, would have been harmonized. According to the doctrine of the literal and plenary inspiration or inerrancy of the Bible, either the author of the second or of the fifth book must have been a heretic. The pet theory to which the orthodox of all denominations have clung most tenaciously, is the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. They might have forgiven the Higher Critics many of their destructive onslaughts against the outposts of their old faith, but these enemies of man and God have invaded the very citadel and stronghold and have dislodged them. From the few extracts of the Pentateuch which I have considered, it is plain that no one man could have written it. As early as the 12th century, Ibn Ezra plainly saw, but adroitly concealed the truth that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch as we have it. Instead of entering into an elaborate proof of the validity of the theses of modern criticism on this subject, I shall simply state by way of a general endorsement of their position that no man can read the prophets of the 8th and the 7th century before the Christian era, with his eyes wide open, and still cling to the tenets of orthodoxy, either that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or that it existed as we have it, in their days. Even if portions of the five books were known to some of the prophets, they certainly did not regard them as authoritative, or as containing the Torah of God as they understood it.

Jeremiah will serve our purpose best, for he is the most outspoken of the prophets in his condemnation of the entire sacrificial cult. I refer, of course, to the well-known passage of the 7th chapter, in which the prophet declares his opposition to the cult in these words: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them when I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." Graf and Wellhausen infer from these words, that the ceremonial laws of the Priestly Code of the Pentateuch were unknown to Jeremiah and they assume that they were added to the so-called Mosaic legislation only after the time of the exile. It is very plausible as Zunz has shown, that certain parts of the Pentateuch are post-Exilic, but whether

this be true or not, we are assuredly justified in asserting that whether the Priestly Code existed or not in Jeremiah's time, it certainly had not obtained position of authority either in his eyes or of those who followed him. The only Thorah which the prophets recognized and to the observance of whose precepts they called the people, was that law which was written by God himself, not upon the tables of stone, but upon the mind and heart of the people, the law of righteousness and justice. Jeremiah was so far from acknowledging any other religious authority, that he distinctly condemns the Thorah, which the public functionaries, whom he calls, Hahamim, had written down upon a parchment scroll. In the 8th chapter we find these memorable words: "Eha thom'ru, Hahamim anahnu, w'thorath, ittanu, achen hine lassheqer 'asa 'et sheqer Sof'rim." I do not agree with Wellhausen, that Jeremiah here refers to Deuteronomy as the falsified Thorah, but I have no doubt that all the ceremonial and ritual ordinances which are contained in the P. C. and after the exile became a part of the Thorah Moshe, were meant by him. This view which is the reverse of the traditional, will, of course, be described as sacrilegious and blasphemous by the orthodox of all creeds, because it demolishes the underpinning of their systems, but none the less it is the only view which a rational study of the Bible will bear out. I venture to assert that the higher criticism, which has stirred up a whole hornet's nest of theologians and theological quacks, will not deprive the Bible of one jot or tittle of its real value.

The application of the canons of critical and historical science to the literature of the Jews, for that is what the higher criticism is doing, will only result in bringing out into greater prominence the imperishable worth of the Bible as a help toward "the perfect ideal of religion." It will destroy the foolish notions of men and the superstitions which they have entertained, both about the sublimest literary heritage of the Past, and the people who produced it, and it will give to both that full need of recognition and that exceptional place of honor, which they have deserved. The higher criticism has already demonstrated, what a rational student of the Bible ever doubted, that there is not and can

never be any conflict between science and religion, when these are properly understood. In the words of Huxley: "The antagonism of science is not to religion, but to the heathen survivals and the bad philosophy under which religion herself is well-nigh crushed." I, for my part, trust that this antagonism will never cease; but that to the end of time, true science will continue to fulfil one of her most beneficent functions, that of relieving men from the burden of false science, which is imposed on them in the name of false religion.

As long as the orthodox insist that the Bible is a miraculous production that we may not search it with the light of reason, but must blindly accept whatever it contains, as absolute truth, so long will the strife remain unsettled and in the contest the Bible will always be worsted. Science will no longer be tied to the apron-strings of theology and the enlightened thoughts and demands of our times cannot be suppressed. If the orthodox view prevailed, all reverence for the Bible would gradually but surely fade away, despite the influence of its mighty past. Here the higher criticism comes in as a blessed mediator. It reconciles the Bible with the modern view of life, and in the light of historical research, it shows us its imperishable value as an ideal factor and moral force in the upbuilding of humanity. If men were permitted to take up a hostile attitude toward the book of books, through the persistency of creeds and churches, there is no doubt that one of the main sources of mental and moral culture would be stopped, for despite the temporal shape, in which, as the work of man, it must be embodied, it bears within it, an ever operative, divine primeval force. If at the hands of modern enlightened criticism, we learn to regard the Bible as a monument of the ancient Judaic spirit, as a genial product of the Hebrew people, whose mission it was and is, to waken to life the eternal religious ideals and send them forth into the broad main of humanity, then will its glory never pale, and its blessed influence will continue to spread.

"Then let knowledge grow from more to more, yet more of reverence in us dwell, that mind and soul according well, may take one music as before but vaster."

DISCUSSION OF THE BIBLE AND MODERN THOUGHT.

OPENED BY H. BARNSTEIN.

When I received the intimation that I was expected to speak to an audience of rabbis upon the momentous subject of "Higher Criticism," my first resolution was to decline the honor.

Yet, after fully weighing the pros and cons, I finally resolved to make the attempt, so, without making further excuses, I shall at once plunge *in medias res*.

Formerly I used to shun this subject and I still consider it somewhat of a moot point whether we should treat it from the pulpit or not.

I thought that we were ignorant of the text of the Bible and believed that it was useless to speak about the Book until we had read the Book itself.

Then I knew the subject of Higher Criticism presented features of stupendous difficulty, and its consideration required a mental concentration which I could hardly ask a lay audience to give me. Further, it is a fact that as many critics so many opinions and who shall decide when doctors disagree?

Finally and mainly, I did not believe any good purpose would be attained by telling laymen of the attempts—and they have been vain attempts—which have been made to undermine the impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture.

But recently I have altered my opinion and I now think that the time has arrived for the vital subject of Bible criticism to be fearlessly treated from the Jewish pulpit.

Why did I change my opinion? Because it meets us on all sides and we hear about it wherever we go.

Take up the *Literary Digest*, and week after week we find articles brimful of interest upon the subject of Higher Criticism.

Take up Claude Montefiore's "Bible for Home Reading," it begins with Abraham. Adam and Noah are cut out. That is Higher Criticism.

Now let us read Dr. Hirsch's *Chicago Reform Advocate*, we shall find Purim relegated to the realms of mythology; that is Higher Criticism.

Taking all these facts into consideration, I think it was an excellent resolution to fearlessly thresh this matter out at our Rabbinical Conference. Everyone now agrees that it is absolutely necessary to apply the modern scientific spirit to the study of the Bible, but we have to realize that if the theologians have been intolerant, the scientists have been none the less so. A few years ago, Science invaded the realm of Bible study, and, as a result, everything had to be placed under the microscope of criticism, of investigation and of research. Verses were then torn from their context, split into fragments and an elaborate theory built upon their ruins. Vandals seized the Bible and, utterly blind to its superb imagery, hopelessly deaf to its soul-stirring appeals, proceeded to probe and to prune, to dissect and to reject, entirely oblivious of the sanctity of the material they were thus rudely handling.

The inevitable result ensued; science and religion became hopelessly at variance; the greatest hearts and the greatest minds in the church placed science under the ban of excommunication; the scientists retaliating by making religion and superstition synonymous.

It was an unhappy state of affairs, this distressing antagonism between brain and soul, and both sides were to blame for its existence.

Intolerance has always been a dangerous weapon in the hands of the fanatic; and the weapon is as dangerous in the hands of the bigoted scientist as it is in those of the bigoted religionist.

Jewish history tells us of the farcical results of the struggle between the Maimunists and the Anti-Maimunists; you will remember that Maimonides applied scientific methods to the Bible which the obscurantists who opposed him bitterly resented, whereupon each party proceeded to place the other under the ban in the most approved Gilbertian, opera-bouffe manner. The result was a tragedy-comedy which would have been screamingly farcical had it not been so inexpressibly sad.

There you have the weapon in the hands of the bigoted religionist; let us see if the bigoted scientist is more tolerant.

Listen how Ferdinand Justi, a professor at Marburg, speaks of the Pentateuch compiler. He says: "A fiction was set on foot that the Priestly Code had long ago been delivered to the people by Moses. * * * a wholesale perversion of history was the result * * * the forgers carried out their work without the slightest regard for historical accuracy and did not hesitate to asperse the memory of men who had raised the nation to greatness whilst they glorified tyrants and weaklings who had allowed themselves to be ruled by the priests. The forgery was too clumsy to escape detection under the searching eye of the modern critic, yet sufficiently well done to have misled mankind for centuries and to have induced them to accept as Divine ordinances inventions devised by Jewish rabbis of the fifth and sixth centuries B. C., in order to strengthen their own influence."

In other words, a portion of the Pentateuch is the work of Jewish forgers who acted with the basest of motives; they deceived the people in order to glorify themselves.

Now—one concession we must make to Prof. Justi: he does not mince matters, he calls a spade a spade, and he does not gloss over forgery by dubbing it a pious fraud.

There you have what Higher Criticism leads to if carried to an extreme and my object in quoting the passage was to show you that scientists and religionists have been equally intolerant.

Honest criticism of literature meets with the Jew's approval, but only too many of these critical professors show that they have an ax to grind; in spite of their honeyed words, in spite of the sugar-coating in which they wrap their bitter pill, they cannot help occasionally displaying the cloven foot of anti-Semitism.

Justi cannot hide his animus against the Jewish rabbi-forgers, whilst De Lagarde, critic, genius and crank makes no attempt to do so. And the goal of many of these critical theologians seems to be to glorify Christianity, at the expense of Judaism, and to make disparaging comparisons between the Old and New Testaments.

"Every effort should be made," piously says the Rev. Dr. Horton, "to show that Christ is the end of the Law."

The more, then, are we surprised that such men as Claude Montefiore are content to blindly follow the lead of such men. I would draw your attention to Montefiore's treatment of the Books of Ecclesiastes and Esther.

He is so dissatisfied with the religious spirit shown by the Preacher that he finds it necessary to apologize for him and to write a reply to his book. But, by acting thus, he only shows how utterly he has misunderstood the spirit which animated the author.

Another Jewish commentator, David Friedlander, has done better.

He tells us that Ecclesiastes is an author who is not afraid to think aloud; who takes the reader, as it were, into his confidence, and allows him to see his thoughts in the very act of their taking shape, and who places before the reader both sides of his argument.

It is therefore manifestly unfair to select isolated passages from the Book and appeal to them as the outcome of the Preacher's philosophy; we have to consider the work as a whole.

From the superscription and the account given in the second chapter of the magnificence of Solomon's reign, it used to be thought that the Preacher was none other than King Solomon himself and one ingenious commentator finds, in the Song of Songs, the ardor and enthusiasm of youth, in the Book of Proverbs the vigor and maturity of manhood and in Ecclesiastes the sere and yellow leaf of senility and decay. But really the most that we can say about the Book is that we know nothing about it, except that it is at once one of the most frequently quoted, one of the most difficult and certainly the most secular book in Holy Writ.

We do not know who the author was, we do not know when the Book was written, we are not sure where it was written and we can only guess why it was written.

But more than that; we frequently fail to find the logical connection between one verse and another; palpable contradictions appear to abound in the work, some of the thoughts and expressions are so obscure as to baffle explanation and to defy interpretation, whilst Greek philosophy has so much influence upon the author's ideas as to frequently render them almost pagan in tone.

And yet, is the Book any the less sublime and Divine?

No, it is not, for no nobler plea for moderation has ever been written, no finer argument for the happy mean has ever been penned.

We can see the spirit of the Book when we contrast the pessimism of the Preacher with that of a Schopenhauer; the latter leads directly to atheism, the former to faith.

Take again such a book as that of the prophet Zachariah. We are told, and it is very probable, that it contains three books bound in one, but that makes no difference. What care we whether there were three Zachariahs or three hundred. We argue thus: Here is the Book of Zachariah: it ennobles, it elevates, it refines, it inspires; then in Heaven's name let graceless zealots snarl about its authorship, we care only for its spirit and as that is sublime, the Book is to us Divine. "Let others wrangle," says St. Augustine, "I will wonder."

We welcome all criticism which can never remove the Divine spirit which pervades the Bible, but when such criticism violates our racial and religious traditions we naturally resent it, and I therefore have to again refer you to the strictures which I found it necessary to make upon Montefiore's interpretation of the Book of Esther.

He tells us that the story of Esther is a tissue of improbabilities from start to finish, the sole object of the story being to glorify the Jews, and that, therefore, in lands of liberty, Purim is a festival which may justifiably be neglected.

He cannot imagine how 75,000 Persians could have been killed; it must have been, says he, a paper massacre.

I need, however, only refer him to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, when 120,000 victims fell, not in self-defense, but under the sacred name of religion.

He denies the historicity of the Book.

I would urge him to compare the characters of Xerxes, as depicted to us by Herodotus, and that of Ahasuerus as painted in Esther and to notice how they coincide in every respect and how the two histories corroborate and supplement each other.

He doubts the possibility of a king of Persia choosing a wife whose pedigree remained unknown to him.

I doubt his innocence of worldly affairs and remind him that Oriental despots are not as a rule very particular whether their numerous wives are of blue blood or not.

He thinks some of the King's actions were entirely incredible.

I remind him that nothing is incredible when related of an Oriental despot and tyrant.

But why do I characterize the methods of the Higher Critics as arrogant and conceited?

Let us turn to another book for our reply.

The Book of Jonah is a work which has always been assailed with ridicule by the self-styled enlightened people of modern times.

Here is the exposition of Von der Harde upon this Book: Tarshish stands for the Kingdom of Lydia; the ship is the Jewish republic; the ship's captain is Zadok, the High Priest; the storm stands for the political convulsion which threatened the state's safety; the casting of Jonah into the sea represents King Manasseh's temporary captivity in Babylonia.

Is it not ingenious? And yet these men deny revelation. But I say that a special revelation must have been vouchsafed to the Professor before he could have obtained his luminous interpretation so cut and dried.

Yes; theologians are not the only autocrats and dogmatists on earth.

But before turning to the latest dogmas of the Higher Critics, let us first define both Lower Criticism and Higher Criticism.

There are two kinds of criticism of the Bible: there is the Lower Criticism and there is the Higher Criticism.

The Lower Criticism concerns itself only with textual questions; it investigates readings, suggests emendations and detects interpolations.

The Higher Criticism goes into the authorship of the various books of the Bible, it endeavors to discover how these books were written, when they were written, where they were written, and why they were written.

In other words, the Higher Critics very rightly treat the Bible as any other literature is treated; and if they would only proceed about their work soberly and dispassionately, with no preconceived

opinions and without prejudice, nothing but praise could possibly be bestowed upon their labors. The Bible is a human book which must be treated by human methods and the Jew does not agree with the Plymouth Brethren, who regard every word as directly inspired by God.

To the Jew the Pentateuch is the most holy portion of the Book, then come the prophets and finally the holy writings or hagiographa. And it is just the portion which we treat the most reverently which has been most rudely handled by the Higher Critics, it is our duty to conduct a searching investigation into the credibility of their theories.

But before proceeding further we find that a question naturally occurs to us.

We know the Talmudic Rabbis were keen critics; we know that the Middle-Ages produced its lynx-eyed scholars. Did none of these rabbis and students ever notice any incongruities in the Bible? Was it left for Occidental professors of the nineteenth century to enlighten us and to remove the scales from our eyes? Did scholars go to sleep for two thousand years? Well, I need scarcely tell you that we meet with Higher Criticism in the Talmud, and as the rabbis spoke practically the same language as that of the Bible, lived one thousand five hundred years nearer to the time of Moses than we do, and were more familiar with Oriental life, Oriental modes of thought and Oriental speech than we are, I, for one, am more inclined to give ear to their opinions than to the learned Occidental professors of the present day.

Let us then now learn the Jewish view as to the authorship of the Books of the Bible.

It would lead us too far and would take up too much time to take their view upon each book, but I should like to draw your attention to the freedom of thought which was not only permitted but actually encouraged in the Talmudic schools.

Take the difficult Book of Job. It has always been a conundrum. Who wrote it? When was it written? Where was it written? What is the subject of the book?

To this day we do not know. Most critics believe that its subject

is the problem of human suffering, whilst Prof. Clarke declares that it is the triumph of faith.

In the Talmud there is a discussion upon the authorship of this immortal Book.

One rabbi believes it was written by Moses, another ascribes it to Solomon seven hundred years later, whilst a third rabbi fearlessly maintains that no such person as Job had ever existed. Further, they believe that Kings was composed by Jeremiah, and Judges by Samuel, which is again bold but hardly convincing; whilst there was a considerable discussion whether the books of Ecclesiastes, Ezekiel and the Song of Songs should be included in the canon at all; happily for us, they did not reject them. In Talmudic times, however, nobody seems to have ever doubted the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, although they realized that Moses could certainly not have written the account of his own death and burial, which we find at the end of Deuteronomy; this they ascribe to Joshua, and it is more than probable that their opinion is the correct one.

It is possible that Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers were written in Egypt and the wilderness; that Deuteronomy was composed just before entering Canaan and that Genesis was compiled from older documents which had descended from generation to generation and were judiciously used by Moses for the compilation and composition of the first book of the Bible. Whether such a theory is plausible or ridiculous we shall see later on in our enquiry.

In the Middle Ages the keen Jewish scholars of the Spanish School who were hundreds of years in advance of their time, commenced to doubt the Mosaic authorship.

As early as the eleventh century, a certain Jitschaki expressed his doubts—a fact which is recorded by the celebrated commentator, Ibu Ezra, who was himself one of the keenest higher critics the world has ever seen, in his notes on Genesis.

Then, in the seventeenth century, Spinoza declared that Ezra was the author of the Pentateuch and the Book of Chronicles is ascribed to the Maccabean era.

In the same century, Manasseh ben Israel, in his Conciliator—a

work which has been translated into English, reconciles the apparent contradictions which seem to abound in the Bible.

Thus we see that the sages of the Talmud occupied themselves with Higher Criticism whilst the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was already doubted by some Jewish scholars in the Middle Ages and the critical difficulties of the Bible were fearlessly grappled with by men who stood at the head of important Jewish communities. We recall the words of Tennyson:

" There lies more faith in honest doubt
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

Now let us turn to the modern critics and see how far Justi was justified in roundly declaring that the Pentateuch is a forgery.

Roughly, the theory of the German school is that the Hexateuch—for it has added Joshua to the first five books, so that the Pentateuch has become a Hexateuch—is a compilation by Ezra or some one of his contemporaries, the compiler being known as the final Redactor.

This final Redactor made use of different documents, the earliest of which is characterized by using the word Jahveh for the Godhead. The author of this document in turn made use of older materials and lived in the ninth century B. C. Then the final Redactor made use of a second document which was characterized by using the word Elohim for the Godhead and the author of which lived in the eighth century B. C.

These two documents are known as those of the Jehovist and the Elohist, and another Redactor combined the two and tried to reconcile the contradictions between them, and his work is known as the Prophetic Redaction.

At the same time the so-called Book of the Covenant, comprising only a few chapters in Exodus appeared. This was added to the Prophetic Redaction and the Mosaic Law was thus given to the world.

Finally, in the reign of King Josiah, the Book of Kings tells us that "the Book of the Law" was "found in the house of the Lord." This finding, say the critics, was a pious fraud, for the Book of Deuteronomy was forged by the High Priest Hilkiah.

Last of all there came a second Book of the Law and the Priestly Code, both of which are products of the exile. That is the theory of the documents; I have simplified it as much as possible but it is still difficult.

Now if this theory is true, it is useless to regard the Pentateuch as history, and, in fact, the more advanced thinkers declare that Moses and even David and Solomon must be consigned to mythland. Thus we see that whilst doubts have been thrown upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch from early days, it was left to university professors of the nineteenth century to slice the Pentateuch into innumerable fragments, to split up single verses into two, and even three, parts and to build up an elaborate theory upon these ruins. But you may ask does all this talk about the name of God—about Jehovah and Elohim—end in smoke?

Are the words Jehovah and Elohim—rendered in our English Bible by Lord and God respectively—used indiscriminately?

No, they are not; and if we turn to the Talmud the rabbis will tell us that Jehovah is the God of mercy and Elohim is the God of justice, and if you will carefully examine your Bible you will see how very plausible this theory is. A more careful investigation will convince us that Elohim is the God of the universe, whilst Jehovah is God in his dealings with the children of Israel.

So much then, for the theory of the Jehovist and the Elohist; but let us now see what objections the critics have to ascribing the Pentateuch to Moses.

Well, they tell us that the ancient Hebrews were a race of rude, uncivilized nomads, who certainly could not have been acquainted with the art of writing; and even if a few of them could write, it is most improbable that they should have given us the highly polished compositions which we find in the Pentateuch.

Until recent years that seemed a fairly plausible argument, but thanks to the wonderful archæological discoveries made in recent years, we now know that the age of Moses was an age as literary as our own and the Accadians' idea of chaos was an age in which no books were written.

The argument that such culture as Moses showed was too far in advance of his day to have been genuine is a nonsensical argument.

Homer and Chaucer exhibit a culture in advance of their age; when a clergyman says home-truths about card-playing he shows a culture in advance of his age. But is it not odd, add the critics, that Moses should have written throughout in the third person? No more odd, I reply, than that Cæsar and Xenophon should have thus written. He merely adopted the historical style.

But, continue the critics, is it likely that there should have been no changes in style in the Hebrew language during the many centuries which the Bible covers? In order to test this objection, it is desirable not to compare Hebrew with English, but with a cognate language, and we have it upon the authority of the great Arabic lexicographer, Freytag, that the Arabic of to-day is practically identical with that of the Kurán—although upwards of twelve hundred years have elapsed since the Kurán was written.

But if these critics would only examine their Hebrew text a little more carefully they would discover that the Hebrew of the Pentateuch does differ from that of the other Books; they would find archaisms in the Pentateuch which never occur elsewhere—no, not even in the Book of Joshua.

But, say the critics, that only shows what clever forgers they were; they purposely adopted an archaic style so as to give their work the stamp of antiquity.

Say rather, I would reply, what botchers they were, for they seem to have forgotten their Archaic words as soon as they came to the Book of Joshua, which, you will remember, the modern critics place with the Pentateuch.

Before leaving this phase of our subject it will be necessary to examine one more point which the critics urge.

That is the celebrated "argument from silence." How is it that neither the historical, the prophetic nor the hagiographical books seem to know anything about the legislation of the Pentateuch?

To this question I would reply by asking another question: All critics agree that this legislation was in existence at the time of the exile, how is it then that the exilic prophets, Haggai, Zachariah and Malachi scarcely allude to this legislation?

But even if the statement were true, it is no argument, for the non-mention and non-observance of a law does not imply its non-existence.

As a matter of fact, however, we have constant references both to the Mosaic legislation and to the historical narrative of the Pentateuch, and many passages are inexplicable unless we assume the prior existence of the Pentateuch.

Let us now examine a typical dogmatic statement of the school of the Higher Critics.

You will remember the venomous words of Prof. Justi who puts the Priestly Code down as a forgery made by a Jewish rabbi about the fifty century B. C.

In other words, the greater part of the Book of Leviticus is post-exilic.

There you have a typical statement of the school of the Higher Critics. Let us briefly examine its plausibility.

The Priestly Code contains laws and prescriptions (such as those of the Urim and Thummim), which could not have been carried out after the exile.

Further, it is improbable, to say the least, that the ancient Israelites, coming from such a country as Egypt, with its fully-developed order of priests, should have remained without priestly laws for upwards of one thousand years.

Then, so many laws could only have applied to the time when Israel was still a wandering nation.

What would have been the sense of ascribing to each of the Levitical families the precise duties which were incumbent upon them in the removal and erection of the various parts of the Tabernacle. In post-exilic times there was no tabernacle.

Finally, it is expressly stated that Moses wrote down all these words in a scroll, and to prove how universal was the art of writing in the ancient Eastern world, it is a remarkable fact that the words for writing and book are the same in all the Semitic languages.

And, most important of all, the narrative bears upon its face the indelible impress of honesty and truth.

The sins of the people are not glossed over; the many flaws in

the character of the patriarch Jacob are noticed even by children; the writer, himself, is excluded from the Holy Land for his sins.

Would a subsequent forger have thus blackened the characters of the founders of the Israelitish race? The whole theory stands self-condemned.

And it is a fact that both internal and external evidence support the Mosaic authorship.

Looking merely at the words we find hapaxlegomena, *i. e.*, words which only occur once in the Pentateuch and are never found elsewhere.

Then we notice the name by which the nation was known; in Genesis, our ancestors are Hebrews, in the other Books of the Pentateuch they are the Children of Israel and then, when the family gives place to the nation, they become Israelites. If we carefully examine the various laws which at first sight apparently contradict each other we shall find that they really supplement each other.

We have to bear in mind that the various sets of laws are given in different locations and upon different occasions; some were given in the land of Egypt, others in the Wilderness of Sinai and in the land of Moab, and again, others are so closely interwoven with the historical narrative that there is little reason to doubt that the event suggested the law.

Let me show you what I mean; the law about the redemption of the first-born follows the sparing of the Hebrew first-born; the law on blasphemy succeeds the blasphemy of the Egypto-Israelite; the law of inheritance at once follows the incident of the daughters of Zelophehad.

As for divergences, they are far more likely to occur in contemporary records than in subsequent compilations and you have only to take up the account of any public event and read it in two different papers to see how true that statement undoubtedly is. Before proceeding to the Archæological corroboration of the historicity of the narrative, I wish you to notice one other important internal point.

It is remarkable how the different portions of the Bible reflect the time when and the place where they were written.

When we consider the Book of Esther, we see what a faithful reflex the narrative gave us of the Persian court of the day.

In the same manner, the 14th Chapter of Genesis looks and reads like a babylonian inscription.

Now consider the two histories in which the Biblical writer comes into close contact with the land of Egypt—the history of Joseph and the Exodus.

Just as graphically as Juvenal and Martial paint the Rome of their day, so does the author of the Pentateuch present us to the Egypt of his.

Potiphar's wife shows us the lax morals of the upper classes—a fact which the papyri corroborate; the craze for dream interpretation was characteristic of the time and place; the kine coming from the river and feeding upon the sedgy banks is a true Egyptian picture; a shaven face was an abomination to the ancient Hebrews and yet we read that Joseph shaves before presenting himself before the Pharaoh.

And then, in the account of the Exodus, we have the use of straw in brick-making, reaping close to the ear, the ten plagues, all of which are common in Egypt even at the present day; executing judgment upon their gods, which, of course, refers to the plague among the cattle, and finally, their longing for the fish, the cucumbers, the melons, the leeks, the onions and the garlic—all these are so characteristic of Egypt and so meaningless when applied to Canaan that their contemporaneous origin is practically assured.

The same phenomena are noticeable in those portions which treat of the wanderings of our ancestors in the wilderness.

The greater part of their route has been accurately mapped out by subsequent travellers, whose only guide has been the brief geographical notes scattered through the narrative, the vast majority of these places having long ceased to exist.

So the modern critics ask us to assume that a redactor, who lived hundreds of years after these events are said to have taken place, had such a marvellous technical and topographical acquaintance, both with Egypt and the desert.

Well, friends, until the critics can give us some theories which

are a little easier to swallow, I think we may as well keep to the traditional view. Now let us see how archæology corroborates that traditional view.

The Assyrian account of the creation, which was written upon clay tablets, reproduces the very words and phrases of the account in Genesis, although it is naturally pervaded by a heathen spirit, lacking the pure monotheism which is the characteristic of the Hebrew Bible from the first chapter of Genesis till the last of Malachi. Then, fragments of the Flood story have been discovered among the ruins of Babylonia, and by fitting these fragments together, we obtain a consecutive narrative akin to that of the Bible, and they are more important, in our consideration, in that they sweep away all the cobweb theories of the Higher Critics.

You will remember that there are in Genesis apparently two versions of the Flood story; one of these versions the critics ascribe to the Jehovist whilst the other is placed to the credit of the Elohist.

Now in this Chaldean account of the Deluge we find incidents which find their parallels in both Biblical narratives, which we are told were written hundreds of years apart. Must we then also assume that there is an Elohist and a Jehovist in the Chaldean account? Further, the strange names of the kings which occur in the 14th Chapter of Genesis have been discovered by the explorers, and another remarkable discovery was made by M. Naville, who found at Pithom, bricks made both with and without straw—a wonderful corroboration of the Biblical narrative.

In addition to such invaluable external testimony there is the universal testimony of ancient tradition.

There are the Egyptian historians, Berosus and Manetho, and the Romans Tacitus and Juvenal, all of whom know only Moses as the author of the Pentateuch.

You will remember that a German scholar named Wolf tried to treat the Greek Homer as the higher critics treat Moses, but the celebrated English statesman, Mr. Gladstone, who was one of the greatest authorities upon Homer that ever lived, declared that although Wolf's argument against the authorship of Homer was certainly strong, yet it was not strong enough to oppose the force of a unanimous tradition.

And then that wonderful 10th Chapter of Genesis; apparently only a list of names and yet of far-reaching importance as the link which connects the special history of Israel with the general history of humanity. It shows how the different races became dispersed over the world and has been pronounced by modern ethnologists to be "the most authentic document we possess for the affiliation of nations and undoubtedly a record of the highest antiquity."

From all these facts we may rightly infer that the Higher Criticism and Oriental Archæology are absolutely irreconcilable, and as discovery after discovery corroborated the historicity of the Bible, the critics despaired. Their whole system is, in fact, based upon a theory and an assumption; the theory is that of the literary analysis of the Hexateuch; the assumption is that the ancient Hebrews were unacquainted with the art of writing.

In order to bolster up the theory, verses are mutilated and everything which stands in the way is forthwith pronounced to be an interpolation.

In fact, the whole theory is clever, but it is too clever, it is too ingenious to be true.

As Sayce says: "Had the Hexateuch been pieced together as we are told it was, it would have required a special revelation to discover the fact."

The Hebrew writers are dealt with as if they were modern professors gravely compiling the Hexateuch, with pipe in mouth, spectacles on nose, scissors in hand, paste and brush upon the table.

And they certainly were clever, their contemporaries were deceived; the Talmudic rabbis were deceived; the mediæval scholars were deceived; everybody was deceived until Wellhausen and Company arose to enlighten the benighted. The analytical theory is, in fact, a philological mirage, a house built on sand.

As for the assumption, we have already seen that writing was known 2500 B. C., and Abraham lived eight hundred years later than that.

We also know that papyri were numerous in the Eighteenth Dynasty, when the Exodus took place.

Most important of all, inscriptions have been found on the site of the very place whence Abraham came—Ur of the Chaldees; and

to cap all these discoveries, the style of all these inscriptions is remarkably akin to that of the Pentateuch.

Now, let me quote to you a few sentences from Sayce. He says: "At last we are able to call in the aid of the scientific method and test the age and character, the authenticity and trustworthiness of the Old Testament history by monuments about whose historical authority there can be no question. And the result of the test has, on the whole, been in favor of tradition and against the doctrines of the newer critical school. It has vindicated the antiquity and credibility of the narrative of the Pentateuch, it has proved that the Mosaic age was a highly literary one and that consequently, the marvel would be, not that Moses should have written, but that he should not have done so, and it has undermined the foundation upon which the documentary hypothesis of the origin of the Hexateuch has been built."

That Jews may be found who are content to blindly follow the lead of the Higher Critics is passing strange; that English and American Jews should be found in their ranks is remarkable, for Higher Criticism is the outcome of the German scholarship which investigates the point of a pin and is essentially bookwormish, whilst English scholarship, as represented by Sayce, Rawlinson, Pinches and Boscawen, goes far afield and investigates the Bible upon the spot where it was written. Now we Jews are by no means averse either to the Lower or the Higher Criticism, our scholars have been occupied with these problems from the very earliest times.

Shall we not investigate sources, shall we not annotate from modern standpoints, shall we not elucidate from contemporaneous documents? Not only may we do so; it is our duty to do so.

"We search the world for truth,
The good, the pure, the beautiful;
From graven stone and written scroll
From all old flower-fields of the soul."

"Turn it and turn it again, say the rabbis, for everything is in it."

We know that our Bible is a human book; that it contains some legends; that not everything which it describes is to be taken

literally; we can be excellent Jews without taking the account of Elijah's ascent to Heaven in a fiery chariot as a literal, historical fact.

Bible criticism, by removing the fictitious value usually assigned to everything in the Bible, removes a formidable obstacle from the path of the man in the street. Destructive criticism is the fad of this age; Wolff tried to slice up Homer as Wellhausen slices the Pentateuch; but Wolff has long been discredited; Donnelly tried to prove that Hamlet was written by Bacon and his sanity was questioned.

Now let us try to do the same thing; let us take one of the novels by Rice and Besant and let us try to separate Rice from Besant. Do you think we shall be successful? I don't. And yet we are English speakers, treating a book written only a few years ago in English. Do you think that it is likely that German professors would be any more successful in treating a book written in a foreign, dead language two thousand years ago?

But criticism is also constructive, and as such it is an invaluable aid to faith.

The critic lives in a Biblical atmosphere, he sees the hand of God throughout the Book, and as chapter after chapter is corroborated with the discovery of fresh monuments, his faith becomes strengthened.

Biblical archæology is still in its infancy, but *ὁ Χρονος εἰρετης* Time is the discoverer, and in the course of time every incident may be eventually corroborated as more monuments are brought to light. Not that we Jews require such proofs; we believe that our Torah is true, that it was written by Moses, who was a man Divinely inspired in the sense that Shakespeare and Socrates were inspired.

Strange to say, the greatest defenders of the Jewish traditional view are Christian scholars; may we venture to hope that our students, instead of relying upon the broken reed of Higher Criticism, may be attracted to that stream of living water—Oriental archæology.

I have tried both and whilst the former was an utter weariness to the flesh, I found the latter fascinating to a degree.

We have now devoted considerable time to the consideration of the Higher Criticism, and I trust you are able to judge the theory for what it is worth. It is certainly ingenious, but, nevertheless, it remains unconvincing.

In spite of the learned and ingenious arguments of the higher critics, I believe that the Pentateuch—our Chamisho Chumshe Thorah—is a collection of five and not of six books; that, with the exception of a few verses, which are unquestionably later glosses or interpolations, it was written by Moses. To me, the Thorah is neither a compilation nor a pious fraud, but a perfect law, restoring the soul, making wise the simple, rejoicing the heart, enduring forever.

G. DEUTSCH: Brother Sale beautifully said, "God is not dead and His revelations have not ceased." Of this statement, I subscribe to every word. It is a source of great satisfaction to me that even the Methodists, otherwise strict* believers in the infallibility of the Bible, in their organ, the *Western Christian Advocate*, recently denounced the Roman Catholic belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. I further strongly endorse Brother Sale's remark demanding more reverence for the word of God, and I say this here, because in our discussion on the Sabbath question, a brother whom I love and admire spoke in a decidedly irreverent tone of the belief that God rested on the seventh day: as if He had been tired. Such modes of expression should be left to the school of Ingersoll.

On the other hand, however, I wish to say with Job: "Will you for God speak falsehood, and will you for Him speak deceitfully?" The arguments of Biblical criticism are in their principal points absolutely irrefutable. It is exceedingly difficult to discuss such a matter in detail. Merely for the sake of applying my "just the opposite," I wish to point out the fact that, according to my convictions, Brother Sale is mistaken when he states that the Book of Ecclesiastes and other Apocrypha have once been part of the canon, and further when he accepts the Talmudic statement that at some public meeting, the question as to which books should be included and which books should be excluded, was discussed and decided.

I see in this report merely a later attempt of justifying the existence in the canon of so skeptical a book as Ecclesiastes, or of a book like Ezekiel which conflicts with the Pentateuch.

In my opinion, there was originally no canon, but merely a collection of old Hebrew literature which the reverence of later generations unconsciously raised to the rank of inspired works.

Not wishing to go into details, which could not be settled without prolonged discussions on questions of grammar and lexicology, I merely wish to state that Brother Barnstein's remarks have hardly treated the question before us. When he says, we must treat the Book of Ecclesiastes as a whole, I beg to differ. It seems to me that the only proper solution of the problem of Ecclesiastes is to consider it as interpolated by the remarks of some editor who found fault with the pessimistic and materialistic views of the original author. The evidence deduced from the fact that Malachi speaks of the Pentateuch is hardly tenable unless we adopt the argument of the old rabbi who said that he could not understand how any sane man could deny that God had created the world, since, in that case, the question raised by Rashi, why this account was included in the Pentateuch, would be without foundation. Malachi speaks of the law of Moses, but this does not prove that by *the law of Moses* he means our Pentateuch. Such questions, as I have stated, belong to the class-room, to the study, or to the scientific magazine.

What concerns us here is the question, how Biblical criticism affects our modern thought. By criticism we understand the examination of a certain report—especially of a report handed down in writing—as to its truth. Biblical criticism, therefore, means the examination of statements made in the Bible. Objections to these statements may be twofold—either of an external nature, such as might be raised against the miracle of Joshua's staying the sun, or of an internal nature, as with regard to the report of a hierarchy and an elaborate sacrificial cult laid down in Exodus and Leviticus, while the prophets know not of the existence of such a condition.

Now the question is, how do we stand as regards these discoveries! Shall we not say like Job of old: "Will you for God speak deceitfully?" Will it do to advance arguments as good enough, when our highest spiritual needs are in question, which would never be

considered tenable in any other domain of science? The late Franz Delitzsch (the memory of the righteous be blessed!), in the preface to his fourth edition of *Genesis*, confesses that he had to give up his resistance to the main points of the critical theories. To us as Jews the question fortunately is not as it is with Protestants. We do not derive our arguments from the facts that David or Moses are supposed to have predicted events, taking place a thousand and fifteen hundred years after their time. The Talmud has interpreted the beautiful words of Jeremiah: "For thus are my words, saith the Lord, as the fire and as the hammer which shatters the rock." "Just as one stroke of the hammer elicits many sparks, so one word of God brings forth many interpretations." Our chief concern is the spiritual interpretations of the word of God. The law of Moses commands kindness to the poor with the impressive words: "He shall sleep under His cover and He shall bless thee, and it shall be righteousness from the Lord our God." We are little concerned whether this passage comes from Moses' time, or whether it was written by a contemporary of Jeremiah. Sufficient that it emphasizes righteousness in the sense of doing good to our neighbors. I may be pardoned for adding two of my personal experiences. When my eldest, then my only child, was a year old, he was very seriously ill, and the physicians, although not giving up all hope, felt it their duty to inform me that his case was critical. In the evening, unable to sleep, I turned over the leaves of my Bible and accidentally I came upon the words of Psalm lxxi.: "Thou who hast shown me great and many distresses, Thou wilt again revive me, and from the depths of the earth Thou shalt bring me up again." While not a pietist, having been raised in the strictest orthodox Jewish fashion, I felt these words as a message directed to me, and it mattered not whether they had been written by King David or by a contemporary of the Maccabees. Not long after that event, I was called to the bedside of my dying father. His consciousness had grown dim, and it was some time before he knew me. When I asked him how he felt he spoke of the Passover festival, which was then near at hand, expressing his desire to attend divine services on that day, and he quoted the words of Psalm lxxxiv.: "My soul desireth, yea, longeth for the courts of

the Lord." At this moment I felt that it was a presentiment. Only a few hours and his longing was satisfied: he had entered the courts of the Lord. It did not matter to me then—it does not matter to me now as that death-bed scene comes back to me—it does not matter whether these words were the words of King David, or whether they were the words of an exile living in Babylonia in the sixth century, or whether they were the words of a contemporary of Antiochus Epiphanes driven away from the temple walls. Wherever and whenever spoken, they represent the sublime struggle of a human soul reaching out towards God. That is my Bible.

JACOB S. RAISIN : While I perfectly agree with Rabbi Willner, I cannot help objecting to his *כאִי נפקה מנה*. There is all the difference in the world whether we regard the Bible, and the whole of it, as the inspired or revealed, if you please, word of God, or merely as something "taught by the precept of men." The question is of the greatest moment. If we still believe that every sentence and every syllable of the Scripture were given us through the medium of the Holy Spirit—such a problem, *e. g.*, as the legality of shaving on *המועד חול* which actuated the mind of Reggio, and on which he wrote his *אגרת התגלחות* would still be not out of place. I, therefore, maintain that we, as reformed rabbis, declare our attitude towards the inspiration of the Bible in no uncertain and equivocal terms—that we stand on firm ground, disturbed neither by cowardly fanaticism nor heterodoxical criticism.

H. H. MAYER: The subject before us for discussion is not the inspiration of the Bible. We are to discuss the Bible and Modern Thought. But let me first pass on to pay to Rabbi Barnstein, as well as I can, the tribute that his carefully prepared paper so richly deserves.

We may congratulate ourselves that England has sent to us this scholarly young man. He has to-day won his way into our hearts at a bound, and we are proud to count him as one of us.

His preliminary summing up of the situation could hardly be improved upon, and it is therefore all the more of a disappointment that he should have lost sight of the question involved, and should

have contented himself with trying to defend his compatriots, Sayce and Montefiore, dissimilar from one another as they are, wherever he thinks they differ from the dominant German school of higher criticism.

The higher criticism, you must admit, whether you agree with its tendencies or not, occupies the vantage ground of the battlefield. The burden of proof is no longer upon the higher critics, but upon their opponents. Wellhausen's main results have, according to the majority of critics whose utterances are authoritative, never successfully been called into question. True it is that Gunkel's recent work, "*Schöpfung und Chaos*," casts a doubt, which will be hard to remove, upon Wellhausen's contention that the first chapters of Genesis are artificially constructed throughout and are not a growth, a living branch from the tree of mythology; and other views that Wellhausen has championed have also perhaps been proved to be weak in part or in whole. But the center and heart of Wellhausen's theories remains intact and unassailable. Right here let me deny the charge that Jewish scholars have added nothing of importance to Biblical criticism during the last century, a charge that emanates not from an anti-Semitic source in the case that I have in mind, but from one of the prominent members of this Conference here before me, in a pamphlet published only a short time ago. Who has done more for Biblical scholarship, I ask, than Geiger in his "*Urschrift*" in one direction, or Frensdorff, to mention a second name that just occurs to me, in his "*Ochlah we Ochlah*" in another direction? Wellhausen's contemptuous disregard for the other Bible critics is notorious. In his books he completely ignores them. But Wellhausen, himself, builds on the foundation laid by Vatke, Graf, George and Reuss; and to what extent Jewish writers have anticipated and influenced him would be interesting to investigate. Granted that Jewish scholars have done little for the support of the documental theory, so-called, nevertheless, even their recent contributions to modern Biblical science bulk large. In refusing to accept the possibility of determining the dates of the fragments of documents on a basis not of evidence but of hypothetical conjecture, and in withholding from positive assertions that they have discovered the outlines and

limits of such documents, our scholars have shown their saving Jewish common sense. If the Bible is influencing modern thought in many new directions, the Jewish critics and scholars have had no small part in bringing this about, and most of us wish that the papers read this morning had burnished up again the weapons shaped in the workshop of Jewish scholarship that the doubters among us might be convinced that Jewish interpreters and critics have had and are having considerable to do with keeping the Bible in the forefront of modern literature and life.

THE JEWISH RELIGIOUS SCHOOL.

BY RABBI HARRY H. PAYER, KANSAS CITY, MO.

The religious instruction imparted by the Jews to their children in schools presents for more than sixty generations, an unbroken uniformity of method and material.

From the time of Joshua ben Gamla, the father of primary schools, and Simon ben Shetach, the father of colleges, down to the Jewish renaissance of the Mendelsohnian era, every branch of knowledge systematically cultivated by the Jews was vitally connected with the theory and the practice of religion. The child's first text book was the Book of Leviticus (*Vajikra rabba* VII., 3.). Even the learning of the alphabet was rendered ethically profitable by means of mnemonic moral precepts (*Sabbath* 104 a). At the early age of six promising youths were initiated into the mysteries of talmudical dialectics (*Low*, *Gesammelte Schriften* I., 452). Wherever synagogues were established schools for the study of Israel's sacred literature were founded and conducted in conjunction with them. Some there were among the rabbis who would have interdicted any study except that of the Divine Law, but if mathematics, and philosophy, and the natural sciences were not only not neglected, but cultivated with greater ardor among the Jews than elsewhere during the middle ages, it was because they were thought to be tributary to the science of religion. Wisdom's paramount importance was declared to consist in its having a divine origin and a divine climax (*Berachoh* 33 a, נדולה דעה שנחנה, בין שתי אותיות). The starting point and the goal of education was the "fear of the Lord."

The almost total secularization of the Jewish educational system is one of the results of the Mendelsohnian movement for intellectual emancipation. Practical interests were beginning towards the end of the eighteenth century to make increasingly great encroachments upon the curriculum that had been an integral part of the

empire of theology. The center of equilibrium was being shifted. Hartwig Wessely outlined a plan of instruction (*Dibre shalom we'emeth*) in which secular studies predominated and according to which biblical history was to be taught under the same standards and by the same methods as general history. Wessely's plan was adopted, though not without opposition and modification, in a large number of Jewish communities. David Friedlander's "Free School," with five hundred graduates to its credit in the ten years preceding 1791, was a radically advanced institution of the new type. Hardly had the ink dried upon one of the numerous catechisms issuing from the press than it was succeeded and superseded by others. Compendiums and manuals of Judaism were published by Auerbach, Beer, Bensev, Budinger, Chorin, Francolin, Herxheimer, Homberg, Johlson, Kley, Lambert, Plessner, Saalschutz, and others less well known. But many strands are strangely intertwined in Israel's life and thought, and to trace back every slender filament in one of the threads would be confusing rather than helpful. How swift and how complete the transformation was, which the Mendelsohnian movement had wrought, is evidenced by the prescribed course of studies of the Berlin communal school inaugurated in 1826 with Leopold Zunz at its head which provided for only two hours of instruction in biblical history and catechism and four hours of instruction in Hebrew out of a total of thirty-two hours of instruction per week. (Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften* IV., 229.)

The Jewish Sunday school in America is an offshoot of the system that is in vogue in Germany. The Christian Sunday school in this country is virtually a "children's church," with the same lesson in all the classes, as assigned by the International Sunday School Board, and using the Bible as a storehouse of ethical and religious passages.

The Jewish Sunday school, on the other hand, like its German prototype, has a graded system of classes in which the Bible is taught as history, philosophy, ethics, literature and law.

"Reformed Judaism," as a clever young lady on my staff of teachers has well said, "feeling the rebound from its first leap, is in nervous modesty concentrating its attention" upon its shortcomings and defeats. The prophets of woe among us are lamenting

loudly the inefficiency of our Sunday schools. They are revamping the musty argument that the religion of the school room is a hot-house plant and quickly loses its bloom, and that domestic influence is the only atmosphere in which a sturdy faith can thrive. The fact is that systematic moral and religious instruction is systematically neglected in our Jewish homes. Were it not for the subtle power of social conventions, and the momentum of heredity, and prudential regard for hygienic laws, and fear of public opinion, the extinction of morality and religion would not long be delayed. In alliance with the forces just mentioned, the Sunday school can be made to feed and foster a strong religious sentiment, notwithstanding the absence of religious influences in the home. The wonder is not that so little has been done, but that without the encouragement of parental example so much has been done.

But the need is urgent that more be done or the decline of religious belief that has been going on apace will assume even more alarming proportions. It is peremptory that we keep our children with us through the *Flegeljahre* following the age of confirmation when boys become most irrepressible and girls most frivolous. The tumultuousness of the emotional tempests that shake the human soul at that period of life may well be made the object of the moral educator's greatest solicitude. But for this critical stage in the child's moral development little or no provision has been made in our Sunday school course of instruction. Few there are among us who have not realized the seriousness of the situation and recognized the uselessness of trying to meet the difficulty by means of the post-confirmation class as ordinarily conducted.

Post-biblical Jewish history is decidedly unsuitable as the sole staple of religious instruction. Intelligent appreciation of the tragical monotony of Israel's post-biblical fortunes pre-supposes a far more than average familiarity with the general history of Europe and Western Asia. The teaching of the post-biblical period must be confined to a series of loosely, if at all, connected biographical sketches. We must not deceive ourselves. Historical pragmatism is not for the religion school. Supplementary to the history lesson should be a course of study on the principal duties, free from abstract theorizing and barren exhortation. In

this supplementary "ethical" hour, constant reference should be made to illustrative biographies drawn from the post-biblical history. Here we should be guided by the curious psychological law, noted by Herbert, that ethical subtlety is hardly ever associated with ethical solidity.

Religion is not to be created in the class room. The religious educator must take advantage of the predisposition TOWARDS religion and strengthen and develop it. But edification is not the purpose of class room work but an enlargement of the area of knowledge. To convey information should be the endeavor of the religious as well as of the secular teacher. The ethical and religious glow will take care of itself if facts are impressed upon the memory that have been chosen carefully in view of their potentiality to become germinal after they have been scattered upon the soil of the mind. "Die Aufgabe der Schule ist weder blosser Unterricht noch blosser Erziehung sondern, wie man richtig gesagt hat, die Erziehung durch den Unterricht." (Alfred Foulliee, quoted by Grunweller, in "Nicht Moral—sondern Religionsunterricht," Berlin, 1902, p. 23.) The boy and girl between the ages of fourteen and seventeen are, like their younger sisters and brothers, most influenced by great personalities, by the exemplification in character of the fine ideals whose efflorescence in conduct is called virtue. Just as the leaf falls to the ground and in dying feeds the new life that takes its place, so the characters of the great men of history are the deposit that nourishes the roots of virtue in the young of to-day.

The postponement until after confirmation of systematic instruction in the principal duties according to the plan here sketched, will involve far-reaching changes in the arrangement of the studies of the lower classes. The chief gain to the younger children will be an increase of time for instruction in biblical history. Moreover, selected psalms can then be studied without haste and with profit in all the lower classes comprised of pupils above the age of ten. The frequently-heard objection to the use of the psalms with the younger children, on the ground that the metaphorical language is beyond the comprehension of any but a matured intelligence, is obviated by an adroit application of the inductive or question and answer method. I may be pardoned for illustrating what I mean

by one of the lessons of this kind that was given not long ago in the Sunday school of my congregation in Kansas City. I am aware of the crudeness of the example that I am citing. But it is a typical lesson and I can vouch for its being a verbatim report. The metaphor to be explained was from the XVI. psalm, verse 5: "God is my 'cup.' "

Ques. "At what times do we drink?" Ans. "At meal times." Ques. "Yes, or in between, if we need it. But how do you feel when you need to drink?" Ans. "Thirsty." Ques. "That's right, but what do you call anything that we can drink?" Ans. "Water, or wine, or coffee, or beer." Ques. "Yes, we may drink any of these; and if we don't drink too much, it is good for us to enjoy any of the liquids that have been given for man's use. But here's a hard question: What is necessary before we can drink the liquid?" Ans. "It must be clean." Ques. "Well, yes, it must be good and fresh and pure. But I meant that something else is necessary before we can drink it. Can we lap it up like dogs?" Ans. "No, we need a glass." Ques. "Exactly; we need a glass or cup. And so the man who wrote this psalm called God his cup, because his soul was thirsty. You see, it isn't only the throat or the mouth that feel thirstiness. When you wish real hard that you had something, your soul is thirsty. When your father and mother are away, isn't it just as if you were thirsty around your heart? Well, that is the kind of thirstiness the psalmist felt, and he couldn't have got rid of it by using just an ordinary glass or cup to drink with. No; but by believing that God is near him and would take care of him, his soul was happy and the thirstiness of his heart was gone. God was his 'cup.'" I have given this in detail not as a model, but as a specimen.

And now let me add four rules that are not generally assented to, but that seem to me to enlarge the usefulness and enhance the attractiveness of our Sunday schools in all their departments:

First. The lessons to be prepared at home by the pupil should be reduced as near as may be to the zero point. Ambitious teachers, anxious to make a good showing, are under temptation to annex an hour or two of the time outside the class room. Parents are, with few exceptions, pleased to see their little ones hard at work on

their Sunday school studies. Critics who doubt that religious branches require special instruction are silenced by the convincing spectacle of pupils knitting their brows over their text books. Long dictations flashed into view in the family circle make a vast impression on the uninitiated. Many considerations thus conspire to favor the practice of assigning exercises for home preparation. To oppose the drift of sentiment and policy calls for the utmost conscientiousness and courage. The rabbi should let nothing deter him from taking a firm stand on his question.

Second. The text book should be dispensed with except for occasional reference, or in order to fall back upon it, in accordance with the well-tested pedagogical rule of variation of method, for reviving languishing attention. At its best the text book is a makeshift, and at its worst, with its flippant tone, its catchpenny phraseology, its flaccid argument, its threadbare rhetoric, and its stupendous misinformation masquerading as knowledge, it is a source of never-ceasing surprise that any should be found so poor as to do it honor.

Third. Archaeology should be strictly excluded except by way of reference to facts with which the pupil has become familiar through other sources, or by way of bringing out the point of a story which would otherwise be missed. In teaching the sojourn in Egypt, for example, the pyramids will suggest themselves, and the statement that these ancient monuments may have been built by Jewish slaves will immediately captivate the imagination. In the story of Abraham's hospitality a description of the sandal will be unavoidable to preserve the full vigor of the original legend, and a digression on the footgear of all times and climes with illustrative pictures and photographs would not be indefensible. The contest between Egypt and Assyria for the possession of Asia Minor may require mention of the Tell-El-Amarna tablets. But the Mesha stone, and the manner of its discovery, and the number of square feet contained in it, and the museum where it is kept are details that are beyond the range of most children's interest. A wish to know something of the marvels of the antiquarian's lore is foreign to the youthful mind, and the effort used in creating curiosity in that direction is misapplied. Let the specialist and the pedant

continue to be fond of their documents and their inscriptions. What the children love to learn and ought to learn is how feeble human beings espousing the cause of the God of Righteousness have displayed the power "greatly to do and to dare." Whether the deeds, as the Bible records them, be authenticated by the ghostly voice of parchment or of stone, is in the religious instruction of our young of supreme indifference. Human passions and human heroisms set forth with incomparable simplicity, directness, and vividness are the sources of the imperishable value of the Biblical tales.

Fourth. The spirit of reverence should pervade and permeate the sessions from the tap of the opening bell to the signal for dismissal. In the presence of the "deep things of the soul," teacher and pupil should be conscious of

"The light that never was on land or sea,
the consecration and the poet's dream."

Reverence can be taught. But injunctions and exhortations will not be of much avail. The children must be *shown* how to conduct themselves reverently if they are to grow up to be reverent. Respect for the sanctities of religion quickly communicates itself. The attitude of the teacher is copied unawares and produces a more lasting effect than carefully explained precepts and glibly recited penums.

The problem of the religious school is not the text book. The problem of the religious school is not how to enlist the sympathy of the parent. The brake that checks our progress is the incompetence of most of our teachers. Given a capable, enthusiastic, conscientious teaching staff, and all other questions and perplexities will settle themselves. The ideal teacher cannot be manufactured in the normal school, he cannot be picked up by the roadside, he must be wisely selected, and the re-adjustment of the curriculum in the way that has here been sketched, will, it is believed, then give the widest scope for his, or her, beneficent powers. We must depend upon proper tutelage in the religious school to counteract the growing dangers of half-hearted acquiescence, and

luke-warm adherence, and indifference and renegacy. When the religious school is entrenched in our children's affection, when they cross its threshold week after week until manhood and womanhood with unabated eagerness and joy to seek for the Jewish interpretation of God and Man and the Universe, then shall we be able to point to our little ones without fear for their religious future, but with the words upon our lips: אל תקרי בניך אלה בוניך

Call them not O Israel, thy babes, but call them thy builders.

The wheat that grows upon the broad fields of Judaism's tillage is spiritually nourishing חטִיִּא דקִתָּךְ זִמְנִין; though some the weeds that may have sprung up, let us continue with unchilled enthusiasm to sow of it, זרע מִנְהוֹן

DISCUSSION ON THE JEWISH RELIGIOUS SCHOOL.

H. G. ENELow: I am not one of the veterans among my brethren—one of those men of large experience, of whom Rabbi Jacobson has spoken; but I have had to grapple with this question as earnestly as some of the older men, and I trust that my remarks will not be uninteresting and unprofitable. I have great delight in taking up the thread of this argument where Brother Heller has just left it. It seems to me that this tirade against the home stands in direct contradiction to some of the thoughts emphasized by the very speaker who has opened it. Namely, if the religious instruction of the school—the Sabbath school—is to stand for those vital, profitable, workaday interests which Rabbi Jacobson has so forcibly argued—tried to emphasize—then, I will say, we must first try to have the home back the school. The home is of the first importance—paramount to all else as regards influence. We must try to plant the sense for learning; for the spiritual realities, we must try to develop a spiritual attitude, at home in order to take up with success the work of the school.

I don't wish to grow oratorical on the subject, but just a few simple illustrations will suffice to emphasize this particular point. Take the Sabbath question: how are we going to teach the children to observe the Sabbath, if we are aware of the fact that the Sabbath is not observed at home, that the lessons concerning it are as a rule disregarded by the parents? The child at once is confronted with the injurious enigma of a discordant religious instruction and practice. Therefore, before you can teach anything in a practical, vital manner in the religious school, you must be certain of an unqualified, consistent support in the home. Only that will make true, helpful training possible.

Rabbi Mayer argues that we must, indeed, insist upon proper instruction; he has dwelt upon the importance of knowledge in the school course, the necessity of broadening the intellectual horizon of the child. Still, he seems to have a particular prejudice against

all post-biblical literature, and history; he would limit our curriculum strictly to the biblical period. Now, I ask, why just confine ourselves to the ancient history of the Hebrews? Why just confine ourselves to the ancient history so frequently marred by sin and idolatry, a history which even we do not understand at times, a history replete with legends and many an improbability that tax the mental capacities of even the riper student? Why limit ourselves to that while the long, heroic, authentic history of Israel is before us, and also our abundant ethical literature that the ages have produced? There is something wrong about the curriculum, brethren. We are not giving our children lessons vital and practical, so long as we are trying to teach them legends all the time, things which many of us have come to regard as legends, to which the paper of this morning has alluded as such, and for which we have to apologize. It takes much time to explain to our young children the meaning and the value of it all. We confine ourselves to Biblical history very largely, instead of trying to impress our pupils with the highest ethical and intellectual knowledge that Israel has accumulated throughout the past ages.

Therefore, let us try to reform our curriculum. Let us teach those things which will prove of practical importance to our children. Let us leave no gap in our instruction between the time of Ezra or the Maccabees or the Fall of Jerusalem and the twentieth century. Let us teach them concerning the growth and development of Jewish history and the Jewish religion. Let us give them things of vital importance—that which they will be able to understand, to be influenced by, inspired by! Thus, our children when they leave our religious school will be able to draw blessings from the fount of their Jewish instruction, urging them to noble living and righteous deeds.

I. L. LEUCHT: I would not have risen at all to express an opinion, had I not been painfully struck, Mr. President, by the pessimistic spirit displayed by the young men of this Convention.

If it were true, what has been said concerning our young men and women who have been reared in our Sabbath school, if it were

true that Judaism has gone down in this country beyond resurrection, then there would hardly be a Jewish home found any longer in the land. Let me tell you, young gentlemen, you have lost your faith in yourselves. Let me tell you that Judaism looks much brighter than it did many years ago. Let me tell you that as long as we continue to do our duty—as long as we come together to consult with each other—we always will find, in the course of time, the *right way* to do the *right thing*. I, for one, will tell you that I have never lost faith, in spite of all that has been said, in our own work—the eighty American rabbis in the American pulpits must have sprung from the Sabbath school.

We should have a little more faith in the indestructibility of the mission for which we stand.

W. WILLNER: I wish to say as to the four points themselves: As to the first point, I fully endorse it; in reference to the second, I cannot totally dispense with the text book, but the text book may be—must be—more or less general. As to the third, in reference to the exclusion of theology, I fully agree. As to the fourth point, the spirit of reverence, I agree with Brother Jacobson who would rather have a spirit of pleasure, a spirit of joy. However, it should be a spirit of pleasure mixed with reverence; as our Brother Jacobson says, I believe that the religious influence is both carried from the school to the home, and from the home to the school. If you see no benefit to-day, you will see a little to-morrow. We are not preaching to our congregations, we are preaching to the parents concerning their children, aye, even their children's children. As to post-Biblical history—we must have some post-Biblical history in our schools, but we cannot teach it to children who have no knowledge of general history. As a closing exercise of my religious school, I give them biographical sketches not so much to teach them facts, but rather to present the influence, character, and noble example of the personages treated. In this way I try to inspire them by showing them what benefit can be derived, what influence can be exerted by their examples, and how in similar circumstances we can use our influence.

As to Brother Sessler's remarks: That we must not expect too much from our children. It is true that the hours are not sufficient. We must, however, make the very best effort we can. Use up every minute in this short time. In general, I would say, that the greatest examples that the children can have in the Sabbath school are the life and character of their rabbis.

JOSEPH SILVERMAN: I wish to say a few words as to a method of teaching practical religion in the Sabbath school. We in Temple Emanu-El have organized the whole Sabbath school into a "Bright Side Club," the object of which is to teach practical religion.

We do not think it right only to teach precepts, doctrines, history, moral lessons. Practical religion is carried on in this way: One of the teachers leads the "Bright Side Club." She is in touch with all the hospitals and orphan asylums of the city, visits them during the week, finds out when the children in the hospitals or in the orphan asylums have birthdays and which of the children have any particular desire for playthings or books. The names and addresses of such children are taken by this teacher and are read at the assembly of the school. Any pupil can send an offering—a birthday letter, a trinket, a toy or a book, or any other article that the teacher thinks will be a pleasure to the child in the hospital or in the orphan asylum. We have found that the children of the Sabbath school take great pleasure in doing such little acts of kindness. The teacher in charge must discriminate as to which pupil should send a toy, which should write a birthday letter, which send picture cards or books. In this way we give pleasure to the pupils of the school, bring the Sabbath school in close touch with the lives of the poor children and teach the blessing of giving as well as of receiving.

H. H. MAYER: I am just as anxious to have this discussion come to a quick termination as any person here, so long as it can be properly settled and justice be done to the subject that I have presented. I am pleased to find so much unanimity of opinion in this discussion. The gentleman who led the discussion reiterated several times that he took issue

with me, but I believe that he was possibly more persuasive than I was, because when he spoke I found I could not take issue with a single thing that he urged in objection to my statements. Strange that he should shout at the top of his voice, and shout again, that he is taking issue with me, and that I should still believe myself to be in harmony with him, were it not that the differences that he makes so much of are, as far as I can see, merely verbal ones. Brother Jacobson declared that he is against the Sunday school that tries to promote a spirit of reverence and that he is in favor of a Sunday school that is enlivened by a spirit of joy. But veneration and joyfulness are not contradictions. Doleful Puritanic piety must not be confounded, as has been done by our brother from Shreveport, with one of the purest, one of the sweetest sentiments that find lodgment in the human soul. Happiness, in the usual acceptation of the word, can easily be called forth and naturalized in a Sunday school. You can interest children, it requires no great knack to do that. But when you have won them over, and amused them, and entertained them you have taken only the first step. Your success in teaching religion will be measured by the degree of reverence that is the outcome of it. It does not follow by any means that the spirit of reverence will crowd out the spirit of joy. The supreme joy, it seems to me, is that feeling of mental exaltation, of spiritual sublimation that flowers forth in reverence. Just because Brother Jacobson's mistake is a common one—but I must say that I am surprised that he should have been guilty of it—I emphasized the matter of reverence in the way that I have. To make the school attractive and pleasant should not be thrust forward as a prime consideration when vastly superior motives should control us.

The second speaker declared that he did not believe that the Sunday school could influence the home, but that the home life should prepare the way for good work in the Sunday school. I do not deny that entirely. But the Sunday school is not more dependent upon the home for religious inspiration than the home is under present conditions upon the Sunday school. The spirit of religion may be carried from the school into the home as well as from the home into the school. What I said here with regard to

the home was that the religion of the home has taken wings and flown away. Domestic religion has gone, and, it seems to me, nevermore in the old form to return. I don't know that we ought to hope for its return with the foolish hope that it might be again for our children exactly what it was for their grandparents. Now that home training in religion has vanished beyond recall, we must not despise the substitute that is offered by our Sunday school, and indulge in tearful talk about the departed glories of religious forms that some would like to galvanize again into artificial vitality.

I am accused of having been pessimistic. If I seemed to have been pessimistic in regard to the Sunday school, it was only because I believed that the present conditions, satisfactory as they are in some respects, might be greatly improved. I am flattered that Brother Sale should compare my pessimism with that of the prophet's. I am willing to accept the company to which he assigns me. But I believe that I was anything but pessimistic. The way to improve the Sunday school is to show where the defects in the system are, and that is why I touched upon those deficiencies instead of reading a brief in glorification of the Sunday school as it actually is.

I was glad to find that after the first few speakers, one of my colleagues arose to say that he understood me. He was a young man. Maybe only the young understand the young.

There was one point that caused me great sorrow, and that was the statement of this young man that he did not know what to do with Biblical history, that he could not conscientiously explain some of its miracles and marvels, and morals. Well, Rabbi Enelow, I am sorry for the rabbi who is not willing to say to his children: "I do not know." When the rabbi, whom the child expects to be an encyclopedia of religious information, says that he does not know, he gives a practical lesson in ethics that cannot well be matched. A rabbi who does not know what to do with scriptural history, who is skeptical as to the supreme value of Old Testament history for religious instruction, I would recommend to learn from the Christian scholar, Kantzsch, who has just published a pamphlet entitled: "Die bleibende Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für den Religions-unterricht."

Brother Deutsch is in error when he thinks that I am opposed to

the philosophy of history. I am against some philosophies of history anywhere. I am against any philosophy of history, as such, in the Sunday school. Brother Willner's appreciation of my position on this question was gratifying to me.

I did not expatiate on every little point as I should have if I had foreseen the misconstructions of my words that have arisen. I hope I have not seemed excessively irritated. The provocation was great. I expected to hear thoughtful and kindly criticism instead of trivialities that I regret were not absent in the debate.

But in spite of all discussion here, we are one, and we all feel that Israel's interests are not being neglected and that the work of the Sunday school will be productive of much good.

LEO M. FRANKLIN: I agree with Dr. Sessler when he says that one hour a week is not sufficient time for the planting in the hearts of our children the seeds that shall yield a harvest such as we would wish to gather.

But I am not in accord with the notion that we should have daily sessions of the religious school. We must beware lest we make attendance a burden instead of a delight to the child. We do not want our children at the Sabbath school *oftener* than we now get them, but we want them *longer*. We make a mistake in graduating them from our religious schools at the time we do. We should bring them there earlier in life and keep them later. After they have once entered the school they should not leave it until they are ready to participate actively in the work of the congregation. To dismiss a child from the religious school immediately upon confirmation, or even a year or two thereafter is a ridiculous thing.

I am fortunate in having been able to put the plan I suggest to a practical test in my congregation. I have in my Sabbath school boys and girls nineteen years of age, outside of the adult Bible and study classes. They are mature enough to study the problems of religion intelligently, and so are prepared to step out of the school into the congregation, where they are likely to become good members because they really know for what the congregation stands.

HENRY COHEN: Pardon me for giving my own experience. The medium of sight is one of the means of attracting children, and riveting their attention upon the subject in hand. Instead of bare walls, and, as a rule, our Sunday schools are devoid of everything that could engage the pupil's physical faculties, the children look at representations of the scenes of Old Testament history. I obtained pictures of the prophets, and reproductions of paintings depicting Biblical characters and incidents, to which I add from time to time. The children manifest the liveliest interest in these pictures, and ask numberless questions concerning them. Of course, this is but one of the means of incentive to study, of which the greatest must always be the spirit which the principal and his assistants bring to their work. As a material help, however, it will be found excellent.

CONGREGATIONAL ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE PULPIT AND SABBATH SCHOOL.

BY RABBI LEO H. FRANKLIN, DETROIT.

In his annual message to this Conference, assembled in the City of Rochester seven years ago, our lamented and always beloved Dr. Wise proposed that the question of "Missionary Efforts in Judaism" be thoroughly discussed from every standpoint. Optimistic as he undoubtedly was by nature, he yet realized that conditions among us were such that active efforts would have to be made if we were to hold to our cause those who rightfully belong to us, and more especially, if we were to regain for Judaism the active sympathy and help of those great multitudes of our people who are Jews in name and in name only. Since that time there have been read before this body a number of papers that have sought to solve the vexed problem of how we may best win for the synagogue the co-operation of those who are now indifferent to it and who, at best, recognize its existence when they require its good offices. Unfortunately, however, the number of the unsynagogued seems to be increasing, rather than diminishing, and the necessity of concerted and telling action on the part of the leaders is obviously more imperative to-day than it has ever been before.

Under these circumstances, we need scarcely be apologetic for hailing it as a privilege to be allowed to say a further word upon a subject so vital to our cause.

It should be said at the outset that the statement of our theme precludes the discussion of those activities of the rabbi and through him, of the congregation, which are fundamental. Whatever our view may be as to the desirability of extending the scope of congregational activity, not one of us is prepared to deny that in the pulpit and the Sabbath School the rabbi must centre his first, his highest, his best, energies. Unless the pulpit is a power voicing to the men and women of a community a message of life and a call

to duty, every outside effort of the rabbi is energy misdirected and misapplied. Unless the religious school is doing a work that is telling in the lives of the children of a community, every other attempt to gain the help of Jews to the cause of their religion is an attempt in the wrong direction. Until pulpit and Sabbath School are mighty forces in the religious life of the people—or, at the very least, until they have exhausted all the power that is in them to attract people to the cause for which they stand, no rabbi has a right to dissipate his energies by scattering them over a great range of activities, that are not primarily of a religious character. I am anxious that my insistence upon this fact should be noted by you, my colleagues, for I would not have the impression go forth that I am of those who are willing, for the sake of that fleeting success, which is but as froth, to convert the synagogue into anything other than the religious home of my people, and the place whose every environment shall awake in them faith, reverence, godliness.

But we must not forget that with the Jew *life is religion*, and so I take it that whatever will make life purer, nobler, fuller, is not foreign to the cause of Judaism and not *necessarily* out of place within the precincts of the synagogue. The command (Levit. x: 10) להבדיל בין הקדש ובין החל to distinguish between the holy and the profane, does not appeal to us as deeply as it may to some others. We believe that it is the province of the synagogue to sanctify the secular, to make holy the affairs of the daily life routine, to make every part of human activity an instrument to body forth the message of religion.

There have been those who, not sympathizing with this view, have held that outside the pulpit, and the school room, the synagogue has no legitimate field of operation, that if it fails there its failure is complete, that if it succeeds there, its success is the highest that it can hope for. And there are others who, going to the opposite extreme have (though perhaps involuntarily) made these factors secondary in their synagogal life with the inevitable result that, however striking their success in other directions, their work as teachers and preachers of religion cannot be so accounted.

And both of these classes have been confronted by the same question: "How about the unsynagogued?" For neither the one

who draws a sharp line of distinction between the sacred and the secular, nor the one who recognizes absolutely no distinction between them, has been able to stem the tide of overwhelming indifference to things Jewish, nor to appreciably diminish the numbers of those born within the faith, who stand, to all intents and purposes, outside the synagogue. Assuming that there are activities beyond the pulpit and Sabbath School which are legitimate, it shall be the task of this paper to point out which are those that appeal to us as coming properly within the scope of the synagogue, and which of them, because of their demonstrable success in the past, ought to be encouraged in the future.

Let it be said for the benefit of those who look with suspicion and disdain upon every effort to widen the scope of synagogal activity, that the attempts at present being made in that direction are by no means the first in the history of the synagogue. It has been pointed out by Josephus, that even the Temple in Judea was the scene of festive gatherings of, at best, a *semi*-religious character and that political meetings within its precincts were very frequent. (Wars I, 20.)

Throughout the Middle Ages the synagogue was the very centre of the social as well as the religious life of the Jew. Naturally, when the local habitat of the Jew was congested and limited in area, the synagogue became the centre about which communities crowded, and the gathering place of the people for the discussion of themes political and social, as well as religious. But even when the restrictions as to place of residence were removed from the Jew and he could mingle with comparative freedom among those of other faiths, proximity to the synagogue continued to be one of the first considerations in the choice of a dwelling-house. Nor is this as strange as at first glance it may seem to be. The life of the Jew was focused in his religion, and whatsoever he undertook had to have the sanction of the religious authorities. It was, perhaps, more true of him than of us that life and religion were synonymous terms. In some localities no pursuit was honorable, we are told, unless it had a religious flavoring. The religious element was injected into everything, a fact that reflected itself in the character of the synagogal service. Joseph Jacobs, in his "Jews of Angevin

England," calls attention to the fact that even partisan political disputes were brought into the synagogue, as when the Jews of Canterbury offered a special prayer for the monks as against the archbishop in a local dispute. The truth is, that religion and the business of ordinary life were so much the same throughout the Middle Ages, that no time or place was too sacred for the discussion of the affairs of business. Thus it was not because the Jew did not appreciate the sanctity of his synagogue, but rather because he felt that the synagogue tended to consecrate his daily task, that he made the Shule the place for the announcement of debts that were due; of property that was stolen, and even of the bargains that were in the market. In some places, if a man were about to leave a city, the fact was duly proclaimed in the synagogue, so that anyone having a claim against him, might be protected against loss by his departure.

And so, as might be easily inferred, the synagogue came to exert a mighty influence upon the character of the Jew. Excommunication from it meant social ostracism as well, and he who cared for the friendship of his fellows in faith, had to be very cautious lest he offend, not only against the laws of religion as such, but as well against the code of social righteousness and duty.

The synagogue was, as it were, the embodiment of the communal conscience, and it linked Jew to Jew, whether in joy or in sorrow, in a very real sense. The newly married man was greeted with special songs of joy in the synagogue, and the mourner, fresh from the grave of a loved one, was made aware that he did not weep alone. Indeed, there was no phase of life too insignificant to receive the sanction or the condemnation of the synagogue. There the Jew of former times not only prayed, but there he practically lived. And that fact neither took away the sanctity of the synagogue, nor lessened the reverence of the Jew for his faith.

Until a comparatively late time, all the Jewish charities of a community were dispensed by the congregation, often through the Parnass, but more frequently through a special committee. Until the tenth century, all Asiatic synagogues were lodging-houses for travelers, who not only slept but ate all of their meals there. At a later period a communal inn was established in the neighborhood

of the Shule. That the synagogue maintained an oven, not only for the baking of the Matzoth for Pesach, but as well the Schalet for Sabbath, is well known to you. Israel Abrahams, whose work, as you note, we have followed quite closely, calls attention to the interesting fact also that many congregations supported, in addition to the Mikva, which was a necessary adjunct to every synagogue, also a public bath-house for ordinary use. The same authority mentions the communal hall, usually owned and controlled by the synagogue authorities, which, together with the "Tanzhaus" or dancing pavilion, many suppose was used for the celebration of weddings and other functions of a semi-religious character.

The school was always so integral a part of the synagogue that we refrain from speaking of it at length. Suffice it, that in every period the synagogue was as essentially a place for study as for worship. We cite the single example of the so-called "Rashi Chapel" or Yeshiva, built behind the synagogue by David Oppenheim, in 1624. In fact, the term "Shule" is sufficient evidence of the importance of the school as a synagogal institution.

The intimate relation between the synagogue and the social life of the Jew begins to weaken noticeably with the political emancipation that came with the dawn of the last century. As the Jew grew more and more into a position of independence, and acquired interests common to the people about him, the influence of the synagogue was relaxed and religion began to play a less telling part in his life. So long as the congregation continued under state authority, however, membership was, to all intents and purposes, compulsory, even in the rare instances where a sense of duty was not strong enough to bid one identify himself with a religious organization. Great as is the problem before us, it is one that is of comparatively recent growth, having assumed its present threatening aspect in our own day.

But the fact that the question of the unsynagogued has attained its stupendous proportions in so very short a time, only serves to emphasize more forcibly the tremendous danger that lies in approaching it half-heartedly or of delaying to take concerted action along such lines as shall be reasonably calculated to stem the

increasing tide. But before suggesting a means of overcoming the evil, let us look the conditions squarely in the face as they exist.

In the preparation of this paper, I have sought the help of every colleague in the Conference, by addressing to him a series of questions, from which to construct my data, and the statistics I shall quote throughout this discussion are based upon the answers received from about two-thirds of the number addressed, and with a very few notable exceptions, including the rabbis of the largest and certainly the leading congregations of the country. From the facts thus gathered, I am in position to state with some authority that the number of the Jews in this country not identified with any congregation, or, for that matter, with any organization of a religious character, outnumber those who are so identified as almost three to one, ranging from thirty per cent. in the smaller cities to seventy or even eighty per cent. of the total Jewish population in the largest cities of the Union, and this appalling condition takes no account of the great number of our co-religionists scattered throughout the villages and country towns where there is no Jewish organization with which they could identify themselves even if they would. Is it not a condition to bid us pause and ponder upon it? Yes; is it not a condition to justify the direst predictions even of the professional crier of calamity?

That we recognize the fact that we Jews are not alone in this dire predicament, but that all churches, with the possible exception of the Catholics, are facing equally discouraging conditions does not help us. That we trace the indifference of the Jew to Judaism and things Jewish to the materialistic spirit of the age, may explain the condition, but it cannot excuse us from attempting to counteract and overcome it. And what has been done in this direction?

There are practically two policies, diametrically opposite, to each other, that have been pursued by different congregations in an attempt to win to their cause the unaffiliated classes. One has been a policy of inducement, the other an attempt at coercion, to which should perhaps be added a third policy of doing nothing at all, a confession that is made by several of my colleagues, one of whom, at least, lives in a city where, out of 35,000 Jews, 25,000 are not affiliated.

Save to cry shame upon it, we cannot deal with the do-nothing policy in this paper, and thank God there are not many congregations nor many rabbis who are so blind to their trust and their duty as to endorse it. In regard to the policies of coercion and persuasion, opinion is very nearly equally divided among the rabbis, with perhaps the noteworthy fact apparent, that they are most severe and uncompromising in their condemnation of the latter policy, who have never tried it, and, in many cases, never attempted to understand it.

Let us pause for a moment to see what it means. In my thought the idea of bringing people to the synagogue by persuasive measures is nothing new, but rather a return to the condition which made the synagogue the centre of the Jewish life of a community. It does not mean the offering of cheap inducements to those who have no religious interest in the affairs of the congregation, but rather the infusion of the religious element into every concern of life. It means the translation of religious theory into practice and the transformation of the synagogue from a place of weekly prayer, into a home for every effort that is consistently Jewish in its character. It means the upbuilding of a congregational life that reaches the people through its example, and not only preaches to them of abstract righteousness. It means the creation of a living faith, for which nothing that is good and morally helpful, is too high or too low with which to concern itself.

To a large extent this is possible only in the so-called open temple—I was about to say the institutional temple, but the name affrights too many—the temple that opens its doors not once or twice a week, but that, open every hour of every day, monuments that spiritual hospitality to every good effort, which is, if anything, religious.

The day in which we live is one of crass materialism and men fail to realize a value in the things that cannot be measured, bartered, bought and sold. "Abstract truth is abstract nothing," was one of the favorite aphorisms of one of my old professors. And so to most men abstract religion—by which I mean theoretical religion that spends itself in preaching and in praying—is also abstract nothing. It is well enough that we preachers prate of the

idealism and the spirituality that ought to impel our people to be active in the affairs of religion for the pure joy of the doing, but let us not forget that the lives of our people are for the most part cramped and crowded with the competitions of the business world, and whatever other virtues they may have, they do not possess the ability to appreciate as they should, what religion, as a purely spiritual force, means to them. And we must face this absolute condition which exists. It is not enough that we tell them from the pulpit that religion stands for morality; for education; for good citizenship; for philanthropy; the temple itself must monument our claim. The temple must be, in the moral life of the community, what the home is in the life of the individual. It must be open to him, not once or twice a week, but at all times, so that he may go there when, heart-sick and weary, he seeks for peace of the spirit as he would go to his own fireside for it. Our people are strangers in our temples. There is not the "at home" feeling there. And that is because their doors are closed to them at the very times when they ought to be open in welcome. *It is the curse of our day that the club and not the synagogue has become the centre of our life.* There our young men flock for recreation and amusement and God knows that what they get there is usually not calculated to make them better Jews, or better citizens or better men. I know only too well that the club as a social centre cannot be supplanted by the synagogue. Nor would I have it so. But I would have the unwholesome influence of the club environment counteracted by the healthful, but not less attractive, atmosphere of the synagogue and the good work of the club as a means of creating and cementing friendships and fellowships supplemented by that of the open temple. I would place in the temple a library and reading-room, and fill its shelves with the best literature available, and I would invite my boys and girls to come there and feel at home. And I would have other educational features in my synagogue. I would not have minstrel shows and vaudeville entertainments, but, realizing a sense of fitness, I would open my place of worship to lecturers on Jewish and humanitarian themes; I would encourage good musical entertainments there; I would give my young people every opportunity to assemble there for literary

meetings and for discussions on topics in which they are most interested; I would have mothers' meetings in the precincts of the synagogue, and, in fact, any effort that is calculated to bring out the best that is in my people, I should feel it a privilege and a duty to centre in the synagogue, for these are activities which I believe properly belong to the congregation.

I am deeply convinced that the philanthropic work of a community should centre in and emanate from the congregation. Statistics that I have gathered bring out the indisputable fact that, in the great majority of instances, they who are active in the congregation are also active in the charities. And why not, then, let the congregation, which is the inspiration for the charitable work of a community, take unto itself the added prestige which the supervision of the communal charities would give it, and the forceful appeal that would lie in its presentation to the unaffiliated, that he who separates himself from the congregation also separates himself from a participation in practical good works? Some congregations do indeed supervise their charities, especially in the smaller communities, with the utmost good resulting. In some cities, sisterhoods of women do this work of helping the poor under congregational auspices, and in other places special institutions are supported by the congregation, as, for instance, mission schools and kindergartens for the poor, and flower missions and hospital beds; and in every instance the philanthropy is well conducted and the congregation is strengthened through its influence.

Not only my own experience but that of others who have tried it, convinces me that the publication by the congregation of an official organ, whether in the form of bulletin, or newspaper, or year book, is of inestimable value. Through the medium of printers' ink, the rabbi can reach a much wider constituency than he can possibly hope to address from his pulpit and, in addition, he can point many a lesson that, for reasons of tact, he could not do in a sermon. I can say of my own knowledge that the little bulletin that I published for my congregation, and latterly the paper I am editing and which my board has made its official organ, has come to be a powerful helper in my pulpit work, and won for my congregation many and ardent helpers whom it could not

otherwise have gained. I heartily advocate the subsidizing by congregations of religious newspapers, whose policies they can, through their rabbis or official representatives, control.

I do not attempt in this paper, to speak of the efficacy of properly conducted Bible Classes, and Young People's Temple Societies, and Woman's Auxiliary Associations, and Junior Choirs, and Alumnae Associations, all of which I am persuaded are so obviously a part of congregational endeavor that they should require no argument to justify their support and hearty encouragement. But, in passing, I may say this: The more hands you can keep busy working for the congregation; the more heads you can engage to think about its work; the more hearts that you can make to feel that they have a share in its upbuilding, the surer will be the part it is destined to play in the life of your people, and the more certain and easier the task of gaining for it the help and the thought and the sympathies of the great multitudes, who, as yet, stand beyond its influence.

As a rule, the children and women have an organization that attaches them to the synagogue, but the men rarely. Some of the Christian Churches have business men's clubs, which, meeting weekly, discuss religious topics. Why this should not be legitimate in, and helpful to, the synagogue, I do not know. In fact, the proposal to establish such a club has come to me from some members of the business community of my city, of whose co-operation I almost despaired. One of my colleagues has suggested a mid-week song service in the temple. Surely this suggestion, too, is worthy of consideration. In fact, any effort that will make the people feel at home within the house of worship, without taking away the reverential spirit of the place, should, I believe, receive our unqualified endorsement.

Before dismissing the policy of inducement, as I have chosen to call the foregoing presentation, there are two themes that ought, perhaps, to be briefly touched upon. One refers to the so-called "pastoral visiting" of the rabbi. On this subject, strangely enough, there is little diversity of opinion among the rabbis. Though here and there we find one to number it among the *חוקי התורה* and though very few rabbis, especially in the larger cities,

find time or inclination to visit their people in their homes except on occasions of great joy or great sorrow, yet the practically unanimous opinion is that such visits do tend to help the work of the rabbi among his people. I have written and spoken against "The rabbi as a pastor," for I know how impossible it is to combine pastoral work with his work as a teacher, but I believe that visitation, especially of new-comers to a city, by the rabbi, or if not by him, by a properly accredited congregational visiting committee, would do a world of good in gaining for the congregations the sympathies of those who are indifferent.

One other subject there is that properly should have been touched on as a part of the open synagogue, but which I have delayed to mention from sheer fright at the confusion the word may create. I mean the gymnasium, which has latterly been introduced in a few temples. I cannot speak for others, but for myself I may say, that I would rather not have a gymnasium in any part of my temple or Sabbath School building, but with us it has become a self-defensive measure, since the gymnasium of the Young Men's Christian Association—the only one available to our boys and young men—has become a menace to our cause in the city of Detroit, taking our children from us on the Sabbath morning, and inculcating with their gymnastic instruction, also the elements of Christianity. But the gymnasium neither makes nor unmakes the open synagogue, nor the policy of persuasion.

In some detail I have explained this policy, which, to my mind, promises much, but certainly not everything. Can more than that be said for the policy of coercion? Let us see what has been attempted along that line.

That coercive measures seem justifiable on the part of the congregation in its dealings with certain classes of people, no sensible man, however much sentiment there may be in his makeup to rebel against it, can deny. It is a patent fact that there are great numbers of our people who have no use for the congregation or the rabbi, except when they need their services, and then, without the slightest compunction and without for a moment realizing that they are asking that which is not theirs by right, they demand

that all the wheels of congregational activity be set in instant motion for their benefit.

For a long time this attitude was tolerated by the congregations without protest and without rebuke, and the rabbi was at the beck and call of every nominal Jew who happened to need him. He married couples whom he had never seen before, and whom, in all likelihood, he would never see again, and he preached funeral sermons over those dead, who, living, never entered the synagogue or did anything else to manifest an interest in things Jewish.

When the awakening to the incongruity of this sort of thing came, various measures were suggested of meeting the difficulty. Some congregations refused to sell burial lots in their cemeteries except to their members, but, through some process of reasoning all their own, they saw no reason why they should discontinue the sale of single graves. And this brought them no members. Other congregations, my own included, correctly argued that the minister is in the community only in virtue of the congregation's existence, and that, therefore, those who require his services, should pay a fee to the congregation. Wherefore they instituted the permit system, leaving it to the discretion of the President as to how much each applicant must pay. This works well enough where the President is a man of good sense and judgment, but in the best of cases, it brings few members. *Moreover, it allows the non-affiliated to feel that, ignoring the congregation at other times, they can buy the services of the rabbi as they can those of the attorney when they require them.*

In Baltimore an attempt was made to create a sentiment among the rabbis against officiating (always excepting cases of poverty) in the family of anyone not affiliated, but the attempt died in its birth because it failed to receive the endorsement of the Congregational Boards, and was tabooed, as you will recall, as the "Rabbinical Trust."

The almost universal sentiment among the rabbis favors some action on the part of the congregation which will tend to force the non-affiliated into active membership, if they are to avail themselves of the benefit accruing from the existence of the congregation. It has been proposed by one of our foremost men—a man in whose

judgment we have every right to place our confidence—that a United Synagogue on the plan of the Federated Charities, would, in the large cities, help solve many of the problems before us. The suggestion is worthy of careful consideration in all its bearings.

From a study of the attempts made throughout the country, we believe that Philadelphia stands nearer a real solution of the difficulty than any other community yet has been. In addition to supporting, in one or the other of its temples, practically every feature of the open synagogue, a congregational union has been recently established, the detailed purpose of whose work can best be understood by a perusal of the plan of organization, and the personal letter addressed to non-affiliated co-religionists in the City of Philadelphia.

The purpose of this letter is obvious. It is to create a condition that shall compel all those who wish to be known as Jews, and especially those who wish to use the good offices of the congregation to help support it, not alone materially, but also morally.

Philadelphia, I believe, is one of the few cities in the country where this plan will succeed, for the reason that the rabbis in that city have made their temples not mere praying houses on Sabbath and holy days, but they have made them the spiritual homes of their people, and to those not affiliated they may say: "We give you everything; we give you a place and an inspiration to worship; we give you a religious school for your children; we give you educational advantages that without us, you could not have; we inspire charitable effort among the Jews of this city; we represent the Jews before the people of other faiths; we create and sustain a spirit of friendship and fellowship among our brethren in faith; we foster the things that make for good citizenship; we bring honor to the name of Jew. Will you help us in our endeavor? Will you dare not to help us?"

Perhaps now my attitude has been defined. I believe that the congregation should extend the scope of its activities to the utmost legitimate limit, and by its work, persuade the doubter that religion is more than a creed, that it is nothing less than life itself. I believe that the congregation should translate into fact what the pulpit preaches and stand sponsor for movements, moral and

force in the religious life of his community, and until his Sabbath school exerts a controlling influence over the children. When Dr. Moses identifies poker parties with the institutional synagogue, he shows that he does not understand the scope and nature of the institution.

It is almost inexplicable that ordinarily sensible men, should be quite illogical when dealing with this subject. The gentleman who yesterday argued eloquently for pictures on the wall of the Sabbath school room because of the refining influence exerted by them, to-day "breaks a lance" in behalf of the club as the only legitimate place for a refining and inspiring musical programme. Where is the consistency of it?

I am especially pleased that Rabbi Jacobson has spoken, and that, too, without having heard the original paper, for as you note he has advocated the very things for which I argued, without his knowing it.

One point has been touched on in the discussion in regard to which I must say a word. If there is a man in the ministry who recoils at the suggestion of refusing his services to those in trouble and distress it is myself. I never have and, pray God, never shall refuse my services to one who needs me, but the position I have taken in the paper would not make that necessary. I abhor the thought that our services should be bought and sold like so much merchandise. I do not believe that our profession is like that of the attorney or the physician. Their services are legitimately for sale to those who need them *when they need them*. I want our congregations to be so organized that every man shall be entitled to the rabbi's services in virtue of his membership in the congregation, and to this, poverty should be no bar. I would that it were possible for ministers to decline all fees, but we know that, however desirable that might be, it is impracticable under present conditions.

In conclusion, let me reiterate this thought. I want our congregations through their institutions to monument the teachings of their pulpits. I want the Jewish life of the community to focus in the synagogue. Let us be able to say to our people and to say it honestly, that the synagogue embodies all that is essentially Jewish:

REFORMED JUDAISM.

CONFERENCE LECTURE BY RABBI HENRY COHEN, GALVESTON, TEX.

We are privileged this day to participate in the Sabbath service in one of the oldest Southern Congregations and in one of the best known Jewish communities in the United States. The city of New Orleans has always been a stronghold of Judaism, and within its boundaries the Biblical admonition "Love thy neighbor as thyself," has been so nobly exemplified that, for the last half century, its Jewish institutions have been an inspiration to people of all denominations. And we are further permitted to mingle our voices in soul-stirring devotion with the rabbis that have journeyed thither from every part of this free country to work for the spiritual edification of a large and growing section of its population—a privilege that is inestimable. We pray that success may attend the labors of this Conference and that its deliberations will prove most effective; thus will we have the satisfaction of knowing that not only is our own denomination benefited, but also that the religious thought of the world has made a forward stride.

Under the circumstances of our gathering, and with a large number of representatives of modern Israel among us, one's mind naturally reverts to that phase of Jewish thought that has obtained in America for the last forty years—Reformed Judaism. That its continuance is desirable our presence shows, and that it will still hold within its sway the large majority of native American Jews we feel assured.

The study of the development of American Judaism is an education in itself and is of surpassing interest. The thorough comprehension of any progressive movement bodes well for the intelligent continuance of that movement—by the knowledge of the past we learn to mould the future.

To the rabbis the stewardship of Judaism is largely given to shape and to form so that it may redound to the lasting good of

their congregations. It is well, therefore, to consider our status and conditions, so that in after days we shall be able to meet the issue.

A conservative people at all times, the Jewish emigrants to this country brought with them from their European homes a reserve of honest piety and a fervent determination to hold to their religious birth-right. When there were but few Jews on these shores, something like European exclusiveness—albeit self-imposed—existed. When the many came and scattered themselves far and wide over the land, mingling with people of other persuasions, a widely different state of affairs confronted them. Love of the old and reverence for the past was still strong within them, but conditions were changing, and modern life and exigencies were making inroads into the form and custom, and even into the belief, of their early days. The interrogation point was abroad and the science of religion as well as all philosophical tendencies were passed under review. That, in this spiritual chaos, engendered by honest doubt no less than by altered surroundings, Judaism should not be lost to the multitude, wise men stood in the breach and did for the modern Jew what the rabbis of the Talmud did for the ancient, for they brought definite ideas to bear upon the advancing times and situations. No new thing, this. Judaism has always expounded the law of progress. The Talmud was a progressive development of the Torah, the Tosaphists liberally interpreted the Talmud, the Gaonim and philosophers of the Middle Ages explained the law in the light of their civilization even as the exponents of modern Reform are doing to-day in this country and abroad. To conserve the Faith amidst its present environment has been the aim of all vital religious movements. Our people, however, do not lightly break off with the past, and while precluded from following their faith according to ancient ritual, the dogma and doctrine was still emotionally dear to many of them, and the landmarks of antiquity were sentimentally treasured. The condition of these co-religionists of our was anomalous. Orthodox in idea, although not in practice, they refused to join the ranks of the progressive, looking askance at anything that savored of change. But anon a new difficulty arose. The children reared on this soil were not in

sympathy with the service of the orthodox synagogue to which they accompanied their parents on the High Festivals—the worship was strange and the Hebrew language unintelligible. They were to all intents and purposes, uninterested Jews. Their history and religion was a blank to them, for congregational schools were not general. Matters were better in populous centers: the religious activity among the Orthodox rivaled that of the Reform, which, by reason of the advanced conditions, had begun to make itself felt. University students in Europe had taken up the cry of progress, and America promised a wide field for missionary work. The Ghetto had shut out the light from the multitude—the more need then, for torch-bearers. The labor of these pioneers has gone down to history, with what result we all know. The debt that we owe to Wise, Einhorn, Hirsch, Adler, Lilienthal, and your own beloved Gutheim, of blessed memory—all of them—will be acknowledged by a grateful posterity. Their work for constructive Judaism will be recorded in the annals of the illustrious and will be an object of emulation for all time.

That the same circumstances obtain to-day in many localities as existed in the middle of the last century, cannot be gainsaid. The recent successive emigrations have given Orthodoxy in our country a fresh impetus.

All honor to those who follow their convictions in sincerity and in truth, whether those convictions be Orthodox or Reform. When heart and mind are united in righteous work, nothing is lacking. The ancient form of Judaism, however, is not acceptable to the growing generation, or, at best, is given but half-hearted allegiance, followed in due course by woeful neglect of the spirit as well as of the letter. No one will dare to say that the old light failed to give a proper standard of life to those for whom it shone; but the most hopeful will not claim that European and Asiatic Orthodoxy will be adopted by our children and children's children. We speak of this phase of Judaism with profound veneration, for most of us are of orthodox parentage and affiliation. As well would we think of repudiating our revered mothers, at whose breast we have been nourished, as deriding that particular form of belief from which we have drawn our moral sustenance. This, however, must not

blind us to the fact that the times have changed, and that ideas, sacred, as well as secular, have changed with them. The advance in religious interpretation and method has not only proven to be as faithful a guide to right living as the mediæval formulæ, but, by reason of its consonance with modern culture, is more readily and more generally accepted. Considering these things, it is the bounden duty of leaders in Israel to adapt themselves to these altered surroundings, and thus keep Judaism abreast of the best of contemporary thought. One need not lose his spiritual identity, nor relinquish the distinguishing characteristics of his faith to do this, but Judaism certainly contains all the elements of Universal religion, and can bring its message to bear upon the material side of life in all phases of modernity. Judaism is not of an age, but for all time. The future, then, concerns us no less than the present. The coming generation of Israelites is our care, as well as those for whom we now preach and pray. We must expect those of East-European extraction to follow the light as they have always seen it, for they are slow to change, and affiliate almost exclusively with their immediate compatriots; but unless we become leaders of the second generation, expounding the law and tradition, minus the superstitions and accretions of an inferior civilization, making public religious exercises of an elevated character and in accordance with befitting devotion, many will be lost entirely to the comforting message of religion. That we should gather the flock before the sheep scatter is all-important, and to this end the rabbis must be leaders in the movement for conserving latter-day Judaism. Signs are not wanting that this country will eventually lead in Jewish thought and take the first rank in Jewish learning. The highest Jewish culture will be attained upon these shores and the world will look to us for the exposition of Jewish ethics. The day may be far distant, but it is in the possibilities, nay! it is most probable. Howe'er this be, our present duty is plain. We have been passive, if not indifferent, instead of active and aggressive. As a notable instance, we have been lukewarm in the support of that one institution that was founded for the perpetuation of Judaism in America, even knowing that for the maintenance of Reform and the spiritual guidance of numerous Jewish communities in this country,

the Hebrew Union College is absolutely indispensable. We are weakening our cause by neglecting to put this seat of learning upon a proper financial basis, for the constant call for graduates of the Hebrew Union College fully proves that the trend of Jewish thought in America is progressive. That which should be a pride and a glory to reformed Judaism in this country is made to beg suppliantly for support. With adequate maintenance, what could not the College accomplish? When we consider what, with its limited means, it has already done for Judaism, upon what a high plane it has placed our religion on this continent, elevating us in the eyes of our neighbors of the dominant faiths, when we think of its usefulness, even in the strained conditions under which it labored during the regime of its ever-lamented founder, Dr. Wise, what might we not expect of the institution as an endowed university with all the facilities for Semitic research? This is not a question of choice, but one of compulsion. This seminary is not a luxury, but a necessity. Our life's blood is in it. Our continued exposition of progressive religion depends upon its support and maintenance, and it must be so endowed that it shall rank with the best schools of theology in the world. The future of American Judaism is bound up in it, bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh, for from this college shall go forth men to minister to thousands who shall be proud to acclaim themselves members of that race that gave the Bible to humanity. It is not difficult for the Israelites of this country to provide abundantly for this institution. We have too much faith in our own people and in their love of knowledge to believe that when these facts are put before them they will be neglectful of their duty. For who will say that this institution has not filled the greatest religious want in our midst? Judaism would have been a dead letter for a myriad of born Israelites were it not for this Beth Hamidrash. By scholarly, painstaking and sincere instructors the word of God has been imparted to receptive minds that, in turn, have carried it from one end of this land of liberty to the other, and if the Hebrew Union College has not hitherto been an institution of the highest rank it is because adequate support has been lacking. All said and done, for the means it had at its command this Rabbinical institution has performed

a veritable miracle. And this success becomes more marvelous when we know that because of meagre patronage the capacity of its work has been cramped and the sphere of its influence has been restricted.

The usefulness of this Jewish stronghold properly maintained will be many-sided. Not only will it give us enlightened teachers and preachers to propagate Divine truths from ocean to ocean, but also text books for our schools, prayer books for our synagogues, and reading matter for our homes. Conferences such as these, with all their practical possibilities and momentous labors, are recruited from such an institution. Jewish national organizations for literary activity and historical research will also lay the college alumni under contribution. To the lasting credit of modern Judaism, of which we are votaries, let the Israelites of this country endow the Hebrew Union College so that it shall be the peer of any theological seminary in the world, the authorized focus of Jewish Reform, whose rays may illumine every portion of the globe.

To return to my subject. Between the sentimental remembrance of the past, loving God, as it were, with our father's hearts, and the active duty of the present in this inspiring land of enlightenment, there should be no hesitancy, even for those to whom bygone days spell everything and the present moment nothing. Seeing that this sentiment will die with them, for they cannot bequeath it to their children, they will have lent themselves to the perpetuation of idle musing rather than to the practical religious life. Too many believe that Reform is but another name for indifference and neglect, instead of a gradual making for higher conceptions. We have become what we are, not because of a desire for change, but by reason of spiritual and intellectual necessity. In this attempt to reach the ideal, we must interest young Israel, or before very long, the withering philosophy of gross materialism—Judaism's hereditary enemy—will prevail.

There is much to be done for the coming race, and it is within the province of the Synagogue to accomplish it. For obvious reasons the Jewish people must aspire to the very highest. It is not our fault that we are judged by different standards than other people, but since this is the fact, let the strenuous making for

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and dates, which appears to be a roster or a list of events. The names are written in a stylized, cursive script, and the dates are written in a more formal, printed font. The list includes names such as "John Doe", "Jane Smith", and "Robert Johnson", along with dates like "1945", "1946", and "1947".

2. The second part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. The notes appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, possibly providing additional information or commentary.

3. The third part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, similar to the second part. These notes are also written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing further details or observations.

4. The fourth part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing additional information or commentary.

5. The fifth part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing further details or observations.

6. The sixth part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing additional information or commentary.

7. The seventh part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing further details or observations.

8. The eighth part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing additional information or commentary.

9. The ninth part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing further details or observations.

10. The tenth part of the document is a series of short, handwritten notes or entries, continuing the list format. These notes are written in a cursive script and are organized into a list format. They appear to be related to the names and dates listed in the first part, providing additional information or commentary.

The following table shows the results of the regression analysis:

and the following conditions:

One last, I have
To which the world's common cry

the glorious Messianic time is what Babylon will partake of all the earth.

CONSECRATION AND NOT ISOLATION.

CONFERENCE SERMON BY RABBI JOSEPH STOLZ, D.D., OF CHICAGO.

מן ה'ק'ב'ה למדו הצדיקים שיהיו מתחילין תחלה באורה.

"As God began His work of creation with light, man should enter upon his most serious tasks in a spirit of brightness and cheer"; and thus would I begin my sermon this morning by giving expression to the keen pleasure that is mine that I am privileged to occupy again the pulpit once adorned by the sainted Gutheim, and may stand once more in the place sanctified by the earnestness, sincerity, learning and exalted purpose of my dear friend and beloved class-mate.

Moreover, I thank God that mine is the privilege to-day to speak an earnest word in this community, noted not only for its hospitality and benevolence, but also for its religiousness; mine the opportunity to bring to you, my honored colleagues, gathered לשם שמים "in the interest of our sacred cause," a message which, warm with the blood of my own heart, will, I pray, find entrance into yours.

Perhaps your views will not coincide with mine, but if there be any truth or timeliness in the fleeting words of my mouth, may God bless them; and as the breezes carry delicate-winged seeds from place to place, clothing the earth with life and beauty, may He bear my words from soul to soul, and so crown them with flower and fruit, that "the plowman overtake the reaper and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed." (Amos 9:13.)

Colleagues, at times it appears to me that we do not make sufficient homiletical use of the rich material treasured in the historical books of the Bible, and therefore have I chosen as the text about which to weave my message this suggestive legend culled from the Elisha Cycle:

"And the sons of the prophets said unto Elisha: Behold, now the place where we dwell before thee is too narrow for us. Let us go,

we pray thee, as far as the Jordan and take there every man one beam, and let us prepare for us there a place to dwell therein. And he said, Go. And one said, Give thy assent, I pray thee, and go with thy servants. And he said, I will indeed go. So he went with them, and they came to the Jordan and they cut down trees. But as one was felling a beam, the ax-head fell into the water, and he cried and said, Alas, my Lord, it was borrowed. And the man of God said, where did it fall? And he showed him the place. And he cut down a stick and cast it in thither, and he caused the ax-head to swim. And then said he, Lift it up to thee. And he stretched out his hand and took it." (II. Kings vi., 1-8.)

I do not profess to know exactly what this legend means, nor will I endeavor to give it a literal interpretation. Myths enshrine a truth also for those who do not take them literally, because they spring from the essential need of the religious spirit to give expression to its inner experiences; and miraculous legends embody a principle also for those generations which no longer produce them, because they idealize historical processes and types of spiritual experiences which ever repeat themselves in the lives of pious souls, because they symbolize in the external world truths, ideas and ideals which spring from the inner world of the spirit.

Repeatedly the language of the Bible bears witness that the poetic fantasy transfigures the spiritual with the veil of the sensible. Of course, as long as men naively believe the legend, the sensible form does not disturb the spiritual meaning; but when reason steps in and seeks to interpret as literally true what was meant figuratively, when the understanding endeavors to petrify indefinite, flowing and ever-changing representations into fixed conceptions and doctrines, then difficulties, absurdities and contradictions arise which demand all kinds of mediations, solutions and explanations. (cf. Pfeleiderer's *Philosophy and Development of Religion*, vol. 1, Lecture III; Jastrow, *Study of Religion*, ch. 8.)

The students of religion, gifted with spiritual insight, will therefore not take the Elisha legends literally. He will use them as guides in his interpretation of religious phenomena, as a ladder on which to mount to a higher realm of religious thought. (cf. Preface to *More Nebuchim*.)

Let our text, then, serve us to-day as an interpreter of that new

epoch in the religious life of the Jew which germinated at the end of the eighteenth century, and is still in the process of unfolding.

It was after the eighteenth century philosophers and orators had passionately declaimed about the rights of man, and the American and French revolutions had practically secured them; after Moses Mendelssohn had kindled the spark of culture, blazed a new intellectual path for his people and pointed the way to undreamed-of treasure houses of secular learning, that a new spirit seized the בני הנביאים the fiery, enthusiastic, gifted, religious young men of the ghetto, which made them long for more elbow room, yearn for social, political and intellectual expansion. The narrowness of the Judengasse stifled them. It bore down upon them like a heavy weight on the chest. The confinement choked them and like asthmatics they gasped for fresh air, like consumptives they panted for more breathing space, and impetuously they went to the prophet and exclaimed: "Lo, the place where we dwell before thee is too narrow for us." הנה נא המקום אשר אנחנו יושבים שם לפניך צר ממנו

Their fathers might have endured the isolation in patience and silence, but they could not bear the social and political contraction any longer. They were tired of wearing the yellow badge, and they rebelled against the inhumanity which penned them up like cattle. Their self-respect revolted against the degradation of the "Jewish oath," and they grew pale with anger when ruffians shouted: "Jud, mach mores." Their manhood protested against their being treated like pariahs and having to beg like suppliants for their rights. It was right they wanted, and they demanded for themselves nothing less than citizenship, the privilege to enlist as soldiers and fight for their fatherland, the right to mingle with their fellowmen, to live wherever they pleased, the right to pursue any calling for which they were gifted, the right to enter into the very heart of modern life.

The intellectual narrowness of the school, the Cheder and the Yeshiba also oppressed them. Though it was their mother-tongue, they were ashamed of the jargon, the badge of the ghetto. Though it was the glory of the school, they spurned the subtle dialectics of the pilpulist and the ingenuity of the casuist, and longingly they turned their eyes to the gymnasium and university, passionately

they yearned to slake their burning thirst for truth at the fountains of universal literature.

And the religious environment cramped them, too. The Shulchan Aruch took no account of historical evolution, and when it piled Ossa upon Pelion and imposed upon nineteenth century men-of-the-world, as unalterable law and inviolable custom, the accumulated institutions of many centuries, many countries and many civilizations, it seemed to them impossible to reconcile the larger life beyond the ghetto walls with an unquestioning obedience to all the trivial, exclusive and unprogressive provisions of the code. It was not presumptuousness or back-sliding, it was not indifference to their patrimony or irreverence to the memory of their fathers that excited this feeling. It was the inevitable result of a change of conditions. No casuistry of word-jugglery could turn the Jew of the nineteenth century back again into the Jew of the sixteenth. The old ritualism made them feel as if they were living in a musty basement, a suffocating cave, a narrow mummy-box, and with youthful impetuosity, with poetical enthusiasm, with hopeful eagerness they said: *נלכה נא עד הירדן ונעשה לנו שם מקום לשבת שם* "Let us go up to the Jordan and make for ourselves there a place to dwell"; let us break down our own barriers and meet the Gentile half way; let us get out of the ghetto confines and ghetto spirit and go up to the Jordan and build there a house as hospitable as was Abraham's tent, a house in which other nations might learn from us our truths and share with us the rich spiritual treasures our forefathers transmitted to us, not only for our own good and the good of our children and our grandchildren, but for the benefit of all the nations of the world; for, in its highest expression, Judaism aims to be a universal and not a national religion. Our house is to be a house of prayer for all nations. Jehovah is supreme over all the world. His jurisdiction is not limited to a particular district, nor is it confined to a particular people. "As He brought up Israel out of Egypt, He brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir. The Ethiopians are to Him like Israel." (Amos, 9:7.) His love and justice are over all, His truth is intended for all. Whatever clannishness may have been created by birth, tradition, custom, common historical experiences, Israel was to be holy that

other nations might learn from Him the beauty of holiness, Israel had been dispersed over the whole earth that all other nations might be won over to His truth (Pesachim 87 b.)

Mark, however, that as "the young prophets" had no desire to rear their house beyond the Jordan, neither did those who with flaming enthusiasm espoused this universalistic interpretation of Israel's mission deem it necessary to go beyond the boundaries of Judaism in order to fulfill their providential calling. When they urged the necessity of a new tent, it was not for the purpose of deserting their brethren and shirking at the baptismal font the burdens of their people; and when they longed to enlarge the tent, this longing was not a revolt against self-discipline, an evasion of sacrifice, nor a desire to lose their Jewish identity. They were proud of their ancestors, proud of their spiritual heritage, proud of the scorned title "Jew"; and, despite their aversion to some of the outer trappings, theirs was the overpowering conviction that spiritual Judaism contained the elemental truths of universal religion, theirs the overwhelming persuasion that it was neither a historical necessity nor a philosophical desideratum that the Jew should break through Judaism in order to reach out into a broad, active world-life and world-thought. It was true, their æsthetic sense revolted against some of the ghettoisms and Orientalisms grafted upon the synagogue. Their reason indeed rebelled against the stagnant orthodoxy and unrelenting exclusiveness of some of the rabbis. Their prayer book breathed sentiments which they had outgrown. The home attached inviolable sanctity to some trivialities and superstitions; and yet they were convinced that the fundamental character of Judaism was such that despite the change of the times there existed no need for them to build their house beyond the Jordan.

If the Jew desired freedom of thought, that had never been denied him in the synagogue. Spinoza and Uriel Acosta had been the victims of Spanish Marranos and not of men nursed in the bosom of the synagogue.

If he wished to pursue Bible criticism, he had no heresy trial to fear. The Bible never was a Jewish idol, nor was plenary inspiration ever a Jewish theory. Ibn Ezra had been the father of Bible

criticism and none had ever dreamed of putting his commentary into an Index Librorum Prohibitorum.

If he wanted science, the Jew had never known a conflict between knowledge and faith. The Deuteronomist commanded: "Thou shalt know and reflect in thy heart that the Lord is God in the heavens above and on the earth beneath"; the Psalmist sang: "The heavens relate the glory of God and the earth telleth of His handiwork"; and Maimondies is proof that the Jewish teacher need not say: "would you be a religious man you must spurn philosophy, give up astronomy and geology, deny the testimony of the monuments."

If he longed for ethical culture, he certainly had not to pass beyond the borders of Judaism. Where was righteousness more forcibly emphasized, where was this worldliness more persistently taught, where was more stress laid on holiness? קדשים תהיו "Holy shall ye be" is the very essence of ethical culture, and "seek me and ye shall live, *i. e.*, seek good and not evil in order that ye may live" (Amos 5, 4-14), goes to the very root of the matter.

And if he craved for universalism, was there not ample testimony in his Bible, his prayer book, his rabbinical literature, that Judaism aimed to be universal? Even though Israel sought in many ways to maintain his national exclusiveness, his God was the God of all nations, the Sinaic revelation was given in the wilderness that every people might lay claim to it, the Bible was to be interpreted in seventy tongues that all might understand it, the righteous of all nations of the world would inherit future bliss, God would once be acknowledged King over all the earth.

And how was this Universalistic dream to be actualized? Not by assimilation, not by giving up his identity, or ignoring his historic past, but by building a most beautiful new home of his own with the help of beams fetched from his nativeland; for in the providence of God, every nation has a distinct place to fill and a distinct function to perform, and the better that place is filled and that function is performed, the better will it be for all humanity. Every people is a chosen people and God has saved Israel so marvelously throughout all the ages, because his mission was of the highest importance, his message of the gravest moment and his example a supreme

blessing to humanity. This conviction of special protection for a universal purpose glowed in the hearts of those young prophets of the nineteenth century, and they went to their masters to make known to them their project of wandering forth and building a new religious home.

Of course, the Prophet, the Universalist, answered, לֵבוּ Yea, "go," get out of your exclusion and exclusiveness, participate in public affairs, share with the people their social and intellectual life, help them bear their political burdens, help them solve their social perplexities.

And they asked him: "Wilt thou go with thy servants"; and he answered, "I will go." אֲנִי אֵלֶךְ

Some of the rabbis closeted in the Beth-Hamidrash and poring over ancient folios, did not realize the progress of time, the vast chasm that yawned between the old law and the new life; and knowing "C' est le premier pas qui coûte" they would not budge an inch from the traditional standpoint. The far-visioned prophet, however, the man who knows the spirit of the times and has the courage and the insight to drop a conventionality, in order to save the reality, the prophet answered: "I will go with you; I will admit with you that the Shulchan Aruch is no longer a binding authority. I will prove from the sources themselves that Judaism is a progressive religion, an historical unfolding; that we have the same right to harmonize religion with life, that our forefathers had; and that in our interpretation of Judaism, we may select or reject or modify or emphasize doctrines and practices, even as in all transitional ages our sires assumed this important prerogative. Accordingly, I will study modern literature, science and philosophy with you, and freely accept their conclusions, I will publicly eat forbidden food with you, in order to break down social barriers and participate in public life. I will modernize the school and de-orientalize the synagogue, simplify and modernize the service, use modern music and the organ, introduce the vernacular, preach, confirm, vindicate for woman a dignified place in synagogueal life, in short, sanction whatever may be necessary or useful towards the reconciliation of the traditional religion with the new life and new thought.

וילך אתם ויבאו הירדנה ויגזרו העצים And they went together, the prophet and the pioneer, and they set to work to build the new structure.

They cut down trees, cleared the ground, laid foundations, and utilizing both old and new material, the plan took the shape of a splendid structure in which the Jew and non-Jew might meet together.

They builded with rare enthusiasm; and beautiful visions of dawning Messianic day loomed up before their eyes. In their dreams, they saw a house of prayer for all nations; they beheld Israel, the scorned and derided of by-gone days, again appareled in honor and glory.

But alas, they were doomed to disappointment! The utterly unexpected came to pass. Under the influence of a materialistic philosophy, carried away by a nationalistic craze, swayed by petty jealousies, the majority rises to suppress the minority, and coins a new word to resurrect medieval lies, to stir up old hatreds, trump up old charges, and re-introduce old hardships and limitations. The Jew is again defamed, ostracized, restricted, excluded.

אהה Alas! Alas! cries the youth, quickly enthused and quickly chilled! Alas! he cries, dropping the ax-handle, stopping the work. We were all mistaken in our enthusiasm. When we strayed away from rabbinical Judaism, our zeal was misdirected. This is all borrowed, חקת הגוי We must renounce our Universalism; we must retreat again into our Ghetto; we must go back to Zion.

The man of God, however, is not so quickly discouraged. The Prophet, the man of wisdom, the man of conviction who does not blow hot to-day and cold to-morrow—the man of principle who understands that methods, not principles, must change with circumstances—the optimist, who does not despair of humanity, who "believeth in God and hasteneth not," the Prophet does not throw down his task so easily. With all his enthusiasm, he is still a practical man, and before he gives up, he investigates cause and effect, ויאמר איש האלהים אנה נפל "and the man of God asked, where did it fall."

He believes in the eternities. The old ax-head must be saved at all events; but new times and circumstances require new methods, and if the old ax-handle be inaccessible and inapplicable, a new one must be found; "and therefore he cut down a stick and cast it in

thither and he caused the iron to swim." The Prophet finds a new handle and saves the ax-head. The building goes on. Israel shall not retrace his forward steps, nor shall he surrender to his enemies, nor shall he return to his isolation.

And now, colleagues, the question confronts us: "Whom shall we follow, 'the young Prophets' or 'the Prophet?'" Shall we stop in the midst of our building, cry out "alas," and let the frame-work, laboriously reared, collapse like a deserted shanty, or shall we seek the proper means wherewith to complete the structure? Shall we brand as a blunder the desire to reconcile religious doctrine with religious practice and shall we penitently condemn, as an act of disloyalty and faithlessness our effort to reconcile religion with life? Shall we deny the evolution of Judaism and declare that the Shulchan Aruch is our final authority, that Joseph Karo of Safed has spoken the last word for the age of wireless telegraphy and Moses Isserles of Cracow has indeed given the final and unalterable decision for the Jewish merchant, broker, banker of New York, the politician at Washington, the judge at Philadelphia, the manufacturer and artisan at Chicago, the professor at San Francisco and the soldier in the Philippines? Shall we again assert that our fathers were infallible, that their symbols are eternal and that he is a presumptuous transgressor who does not conform literatim and verbatim to the traditional law? Shall we confess that it was disloyalty to our faith to pray for the "Redemption" and not the "redeemer," a blasphemy to eliminate the prayer for the Babylonian Gaonim, the prayer for resurrection, for the rebuilding of the temple, the restitution of sacrifices? Shall we give up our Messianic standpoint, our union prayer-book, our choir, organ and family pew, our confirmation—in short, abandon the new house at the Jordan, lay down the work, and return to the isolation of Jerusalem?

Colleagues, reaction is in the air. Is it not symptomatic that Reformed Jews should endow an orthodox seminary? It is a well-known fact that in thesecond and third generations of a newspiritual movement the enthusiasm evaporates and a formal religion of law and ceremony takes its place.

The history of religion proves that after a decisive step of reform

has been taken, the pendulum swings from one side to the other in the endeavor to realize practically the high ideals of the religious leaders which were beyond the intellectual grasp of the masses. (Jastrow, *Study of Religion*, p. 114.)

We all know, moreover, that conformity demands the least thought and effort; and, since men follow the path of least resistance the more indifferent they are, the more stress they lay on the form, the less they care for the spirit. It is the most intensely religious who first grow impatient with ritualism; it is the least religious who become the easiest victims of superstition, fanaticism and romanticism.

Moreover, more than half a million of Russian and Rumanian Jews have landed on these shores during the last twenty years; they are ritualists by every cherished association of their lives.

And the Zionist, too, is an anti-reformer. In Berlin, at the last Repraesentantenwahl, the program of the Zionistic party was consistently the rejection of an additional Sunday service, the rigid exclusion of any language but Hebrew from public service, and the increase of strictly denominational elementary schools. The Zionist denies our interpretation of the Diaspora and sneers at our claims of a mission. He is not with us.

And who doubts but that all these ritualistic reactionaries will now endeavor to buttress themselves behind the sweet-savory name of the great Scholar who has just been transplanted to our shores?

It therefore behooves us, colleagues, to take once more an aggressive stand, to affirm positively in a campaign of education that the reform principle is not *חילול*, a disloyalty to our fathers, but is the legitimate interpretation of the religion of our ancestors, the only interpretation which will enable our children to say "the God of our fathers is our God." It behooves us to declare with all the positiveness, fervor and hopefulness of the Prophet that the issue is not "Emergence or Submergence," the issue is "Consecration and not Isolation."

I, for one, can never believe that Submergence must be the inevitable outcome of the dispersion. A minority need not be submerged in a majority. The Jews enjoyed material prosperity and social equality in Spain, equal to if not greater than that of the

American Jews, and yet the Spanish period was the golden age of Jewish history; and so strong was the Jewish consciousness on the Iberian Peninsula that Marranos of the tenth generation not only remembered their ancestry, but, for their faith, sacrificed their lives on the funeral pyre. On August 1, 1826, three hundred and thirty-four (334) years after the expulsion, the last Marrano was burnt at Valencia; and newly-discovered documents have just disclosed the astounding fact that, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, the number of Jewish victims of the *auto-da-fé* was nearly as great in Spain as it had been at the end of the fifteenth century. (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1901, p. 396.)

I believe profoundly that a minority can maintain its separate existence in the midst of the majority, even as the Gulf Stream is a part of and yet distinct from the vast ocean in which it never loses itself. But to maintain this individuality the minority must possess an intense belief in the purpose for which it stands distinct, and must possess the moral courage, the enthusiasm, the self-sacrifice to harmonize this belief with practice in the synagogue, in the home and in public life.

Mr. Zangwill is right. If we will not have a political Zion, we must create for ourselves a spiritual Zion; otherwise we have no *raison d'être*. If we feel that America is our Palestine and Washington is our Zion, then the only justification for our separate existence is a religious one; and if we would maintain this, must we strengthen the Jewish consciousness, must we have a Sabbath, must we sanctify the home, must we foster a passionate love for Jewish lore, must we show an attachment to the synagogue, based upon whole-souled conviction and not dependent upon "the ease of the pew, the tone of the organ, the ability of the choir or the brevity and sparkle of the sermon, as if the minister were in one and the same category as the milliner and dressmaker, the actor and opera singer."

Consecration, קדשים תהיי not Isolation must be our watch-word. The structure of Judaism as designed by the Prophets is by no means complete, and it is we who are best equipped to continue the building; we who, if the one ax-handle is lost, are not afraid to carve out another. That is our advantage and therefore our responsibility.

It is *we* who must rear the religious home of our American children. They will never, never be able to worship in an eighteenth century synagogue; and if by a passionate consecration we shall be able to show to our immigrants that our institutions are able to do for us and our children what their institutions did for them and their fathers, then will they come to us, as surely as there is a God in heaven. *We* must do the building, and if we have made mistakes and used the wrong ax-handles, let us not be ashamed to acknowledge our error and devise other tools. *We* must continue the building, and if, in the excitement of construction and under the urgent necessities of the work, we have overlooked valuable material, let us never lose sight of the fact that our home can best be reared on foundations hallowed by historical reminiscences.

ונקחה משם איש קורה אחת

Forms we must have. Religious principles can not float in the air disembodied. Christianity arose as a protest against Pharisaism, and yet both Greek and Roman Catholicism developed a ritualism that in elaborateness and minuteness far surpassed the ceremonies of the Pharisees. It is folly to presume that we can dispense altogether with symbolism, but in establishing symbols for the twentieth century our advantage lies in the fact that we do not have to use *all* the beams of the past, even those that are decayed or have been rendered unsuitable by reason of the pressure of the times. Yet they mistake the philosophy of Reform altogether who disregard the influence of historical forces, and who fail to recognize that "the safest way to religious and ethical progress for the Jew lies in the field of his historical reminiscences."

Colleagues, this is not the time to cry. Alas! This is the time to build. "The nineteenth century has borne the brunt, the twentieth will reap the fruition." These are the last words recorded of John Fiske, the sober historian and philosopher. Glorious task! glorious vision! Ours shall be the duty of fulfilling the task, ours the joy of living in the vision. There never was an age in which it was a greater privilege to live than in the present, never an age that promised more than does the one about to be born. Our fathers cleared the way for us and we are proud of them. May we so build

that our children will have equal cause to be proud of us. Let each one of us bring to the building his beam—his congregation—and by this faithful consecration will the great temple of our hopes and our prayers be reared to completion. To this end במהרה בימינו may the blessings of God be with us, for, except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Amen!

ISAAC MYER WISE

... FOUNDER OF ...

**Central Conference of
American Rabbis**

PRESIDENT 1889-1900

IN MEMORIAM OF
REV. DR. ADOLPH MOSES

RABBI OF ADAS YESHURUN, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Words are inadequate to express the grief and sorrow with which the death of our colleague has filled our hearts. The faithful shepherd, the diligent worker in the vineyard of the Lord, the conscientious teacher of Judaism's sacred truths has been called to his heavenly abode. חבל על דאברין. ולא משתכחין. We sadly miss him in our councils. Alas! we shall never again sit enthralled under the spell of his inspiring eloquence, under the charm of his genial enthusiasm. זכר צדיק לברכה. Adolph Moses has been removed from our midst, but his memory can never vanish, his name will ever be held dear by us. What he has accomplished in his holy vocation, what he has done in the furtherance of our sacred cause, is written indelibly in the annals of American Judaism. To the cause of liberty and humanity for which he fought in the days of youth, he staunchly adhered in this land of freedom. On the soil of our Republic he aided in implanting Israel's religion untrammelled by the shackles of the dark ages. Faithfully he stood at the side of our revered leader Isaac M. Wise and rendered efficient service in cementing the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in building up the Hebrew Union College and advancing its standards, and in establishing the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Truly of him we may say: זחירו בזהר הרקיע ומצדיקי הרבים ככוכב'ם לעולם ועד.

The remembrance of such a life of blessed activity, so rich in praiseworthy deeds, must ever be a source of consolation to his family and will surely help them to bear with resignation their great loss.

To the wife and children, bereaved of an affectionate husband and father, we extend our heartfelt sympathy and this tribute of our sincere condolence. Congregation Adas Yeshurun, which Adolph Moses guided by word and example, to which for more than two decades he was a true leader in the paths of virtue and faith, can never cease to revere his cherished memory enshrined in the depths of their hearts. In the name of the Central Conference of American Rabbis,

A. GUTTMACHER, *Recording Secretary.*
JOSEPH SILVERMAN, *President.*

G. DEUTSCH,
C. LEVIAS,
S. MANNHEIMER.

MEMBERS OF THE

Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Please notify the Corresponding Secretary of any change in your address or position, so that he can rectify any mistake which may have been made in the directory of the members. A correct list can be obtained only with the kind assistance of the members.

HONORARY MEMBERS

BERNHARD FELSENTHAL, Ph.D., Rabbi *emeritus*, Zion
Congregation, 3238 Calumet Avenue, - - Chicago, Ill.

GUSTAV GOTTHEIL, Ph.D., Rabbi *emeritus*, Temple Emanu-El,
681 Madison Avenue, - - - - New York, N. Y.

LIPPMAN MAYER, Ph.D., Rabbi *emeritus*, Congregation Rodef
Sholem, 928 Western Avenue, - - Allegheny, Pa.

ALOIS KAISER, Cantor, Oheb Shalom Congregation,
1713 Linden Avenue, - - - - Baltimore, Md.

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Israel Aaron, B.A., D.D., Rabbi, Temple Beth Zion,
748 Auburn Avenue, - - - - Buffalo, N. Y.

Abraham S. Anspacher, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed,
333 Monroe Avenue, - - - - Scranton, Pa.

Henry Barnstein, Ph.D., Rabbi, Beth Israel,
1801 Rusk Avenue, - - - - Houston, Tex.

Solomon H. Bauer, Moses Montefiore Congregation, Chicago, Ill.

Raphael Benjamin, M.A., Associate Rabbi,
Temple Beth Elohim, - - - - Brooklyn, N. Y.

Henry Berkowitz, D.D., Rabbi, Rodeph Shalom Congregation,
1539 North Thirty-third Street, - - Philadelphia, Pa.

David Blaustein, M.A., Superintendent of Educational Alliance,
197 East Broadway, - - - - New York, N. Y.

Jacob Bloch, M.A., LL.D., Rabbi, late of Congregation Beth Israel,
35 North Eighteenth Street, - - - Portland, Ore.

Benjamin A. Bonnheim, M.D., Rabbi, Montefiore Congregation,
Las Vegas, New Mexico.

S. G. Bottigheimer, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
211 South Commerce Street, - - - Natchez, Miss.

Abraham Brill, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, Helena, Ark.

Edward N. Calisch, B.L., B.H., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Ahaba,
1036 West Grace Street, - - - Richmond, Va.

Victor Caro, Rabbi, Congregation B'ne Jeshurun,
917 Cedar Street, - - - - Milwaukee, Wis.

H. C. M. Chumaceiro, Rabbi, - - Curacao, Dutch West Indies.

Henry Cohen, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
1920 Broadway, - - - - Galveston, Tex.

Simon R. Cohen, B.A., Rabbi, Ohel Sholom Congregation,
Monticello Hotel, - - - - Norfolk, Va.

Frederick Cohn, M.A., Rabbi, Achduth Veshalom Congregation,
144 East Main Street, - - - Fort Wayne, Ind.

Max C. Currick, A.B., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation,
Kimberley Hotel, - - - - - Erie, Pa.

David Davidson, D.D., Rabbi, Agudath Jeshorim Congregation,
57 East 61st Street, - - - - - New York City.

Gotthard Deutsch, Ph.D., Professor Hebrew Union College,
Hyde Park, - - - - - Cincinnati, O.

Maurice Eisenberg, Rabbi, - - - - - Butte, Mont.

H. J. Elkin, Rabbi, - - - - - Newburg, N. Y.

Meyer Elkin, Rabbi, Beth Israel Congregation,
16 Shultas Place, - - - - - Hartford, Conn.

Barnett A. Elzas, Rabbi, Beth Elohim Congregation,
Charleston, S. C.

H. G. Enelow, D.D., Rabbi, Adas Israel,
722 West Chestnut Street, - - - - - Louisville, Ky.

Elias Eppstein, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Shalom,
437 Sixth Avenue, North, - - - - - Quincy, Ill.

M. Faber, Rabbi, Beth-El Congregation,
320 South College Street, - - - - - Tyler, Tex.

J. Feuerlicht, Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel, Augusta, Ga.

Morris Marcus Feuerlicht, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Ahawas
Achim, - - - - - Lafayette, Ind.

William H. Fineshriber, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel,
804 West Sixth Street, - - - - - Davenport, Ia.

Charles Fleischer, B.L., Rabbi, Temple Adath Israel,
189 Grampian Way, Lavin Hill, - - Boston, Mass.

Leo. M. Franklin, B.L., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El,
71 Brainard Street, - - - - Detroit, Mich.

Sigmund Frey, Rabbi, - - - - Wabash, Ind.

Joseph Friedlander, Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, Beaumont, Tex.

M. Friedlander, Rabbi, First Hebrew Congregation,
1009 Castro Street, - - - - Oakland, Cal.

William S. Friedman, B.L., Rabbi, Temple Emanuel,
1432 Grant Avenue, - - - - Denver, Col.

Charles J. Freund, B.S., B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Shomer
Emoonim,
2055 Franklin Avenue, - - - - Toledo, O.

Emanuel Gerechter, Rabbi, Temple Zion,
671 Edwards Street, - - - - Appleton, Wis.

B. Glueck, Rabbi,
77 Baldwin Street, - - - - Newark, N. J.

Bennett Grad, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel,
Rondout, N. Y.

William H. Greenburg, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El,
108 Browder Street, - - - - Dallas, Tex.

Samuel Greenfield, Rabbi, Mt. Zion Congregation,
22 East 114th Street, - - - - New York City.

Moses J. Gries, Rabbi, The Temple,
45 Oakdale Street, - - - - Cleveland, O.

J. B. Grossman, Rabbi, Congregation Rodef Sholem,
Youngstown, O.

Louis Grossmann, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation K. K. Bene Yeshurun,
2212 Park Avenue, Walnut Hills, - - Cincinnati, O.

Rudolph Grossman, B.L., D.D., Rabbi, Temple Rodeph Sholom,
1347 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Adolf Guttmacher, Ph.D., Rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Cong'n,
2239 Bolton Avenue, - - - - Baltimore, Md.

Adolph Guttman, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Society of Concord,
102 Walnut Place, - - - - Syracuse, N. Y.

Maurice H. Harris, A.M., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel of Harlem,
10 East 129th Street, - - - - New York City.

Leon Harrison, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel,
Hotel Berlin, - - - - St. Louis, Mo.

Sigmund Hecht, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai B'rith,
817 Beacon Street, - - - - Los Angeles, Cal.

Maximillian Heller, M.L., Rabbi, Temple Sinai,
1828 Marengo Street, - - - - New Orleans, La.

Joseph Herz, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
Main Street, - - - - Columbus, Miss.

Emanuel L. Hess, Rabbi,
52 Tilton Street, - - - - St. Paul, Minn.

Emil G. Hirsch, Ph.D., LL.D., Rabbi, Chicago Sinai Congregation,
3612 Grand Boulevard, - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Abram Hirschberg, B.A., Rabbi, North Chicago Hebrew Congregation,
373 Elm Street, - - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Samuel Hirschberg, B.L., Rabbi, Temple Ohabei Shalom,
33 Coolidge Street, - - - Brookline, Boston, Mass.

G. N. Houseman, Rabbi, - - - - - Providence, R. I.

Abram S. Isaacs, Ph.D., Rabbi, Barnert Memorial Temple, Paterson, N. J.,
2 West 14th Street, - - - - - New York.

Pizer W. Jacobs, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Albert,
418 East Railroad Avenue, - - - Albuquerque, New Mex.

Jacob S. Jacobson, Ph.D., Rabbi, Zion Congregation of West Chicago,
863 Walnut Street, - - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Moses P. Jacobson, B.H., B.A., Congregation Hebrew Zion,
611 Cotton Street, P. O. Box 299, - - - Shreveport, La.

Felix W. Jesselson, Rabbi,
109 Ransom Street, - - - - - Grand Rapids, Mich.

Theodore F. Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Temple de Hirsch,
607 Sixth Avenue, - - - - - Seattle, Wash.

Joseph Saul Kornfeld, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth,
Pine Bluff, Ark.

David Klein, B.Ph., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
526 East Main Street, - - - - - Columbus, O.

Israel Klein, B.H., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
514 Upper Seventh Street, - - - - - Evansville, Ind.

M. Klein, Rabbi, Temple B'nai Israel, - - Baton Rouge, La.

K. Kohler, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El,
115 East 71st Street, - - - New York City.

Mayer Kopfsstein, Rabbi, - - - Perth Amboy, N. J.

Joseph Krauskopf, D.D., Rabbi, Reform Cong'n Keneseth Israel,
122 West Manheim Street, - - - Philadelphia, Pa.

Max Landsberg, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Berith Kodesh,
420 East Main Street, - - - Rochester, N. Y.

David Lefkowitz, B.L., B.S., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun,
18 South Boulevard, - - - Dayton, O.

Emil William Leipziger, B.H., B.A., Rabbi, Temple Israel,
706 South Fifth Street, - - - Terre Haute, Ind.

I. L. Leucht, Rabbi, Touro Synagogue,
844 Carondelet Street, - - - New Orleans, La.

Joseph Leucht, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun,
697 High Street, - - - Newark, N. J.

Charles S. Levi, B.A., Rabbi, Anshai Emeth,
National Hotel, - - - Peoria, Ill.

Harry Levi, Rabbi, Congregation Leshem Shomayim,
76 Fifteenth Street, - - - Wheeling, W. Va.

Caspar Levias, M.A., Professor, Hebrew Union College,
2521 Kemper Lane, - - - Cincinnati, O.

Abraham R. Levy, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Abraham,
15 York Street, - - - Chicago, Ill.

Clifton Harby Levy, B.A.,
Hotel Balmoral, - - - - New York, N. Y.

David Levy, Rabbi, Congregation Mishkan Israel,
New Haven, Conn.

Edward S. Levy, Rabbi, Mishkan Israel, - - - Selma, Ala.

Isidore Lewinthal, Ph.D., Rabbi, Ohavai Sholom Congregation,
1912 West End Avenue, - - - Nashville, Tenn.

Wm. Loewenberg, Cantor, Congregation Rodeph Sholom,
1842 North Thirteenth Street, - - Philadelphia, Pa.

Alexander Lyons, B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

M. Machol, Ph.D., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation,
320 Scovill Avenue, - - - - Cleveland, O.

Julius M. Magil, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El, Corsicana, Tex.

H. Malter, Ph.D., Professor Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.

Jacob Mandel, Ph.D., M.A., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation,
62 West 118th Street, - - - - New York City.

Leo Mannheimer, Rabbi, Congregation Mitzpah,
Chattanooga, Tenn.

S. Mannheimer, B.L., Professor, Hebrew Union College,
639 June Street, - - - - Cincinnati, O.

Isaac E. Marcuson, B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel,
126 Washington Avenue, - - - - Macon, Ga.

Elias Margolis, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Re'in Ahuvim,
11 East Park Street, - - - - Stockton, Cal.

Max L. Margolis, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages,
University of California, - - - - Berkeley, Cal.

Samuel Marks, Rabbi, Temple Beth-El,
415 Pecan Street, - - - - San Antonio, Tex.

David Marx, Rabbi, Hebrew Benevolent Congregation,
270 Whitehall Street, - - - - Atlanta, Ga.

Harry H. Mayer, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jehudah,
2216 East Twelfth Street, - - - - Kansas City, Mo.

F. de Sola Mendes, Ph.D., Rabbi, West End Synagogue,
154 West 82d Street, - - - - New York, N. Y.

Aaron J. Messing, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Sholom,
4337 Vincennes Avenue, - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Abraham Joseph Messing, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-Or,
28 Clayton Street, - - - - Montgomery, Ala.

Henry J. Messing, Rabbi, United Hebrew Congregation,
4439 Delmar Avenue, - - - - St. Louis, Mo.

Mayer Messing, Rabbi, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation,
523 North Delever Street, - - - - Indianapolis, Ind.

Julius H. Mayer, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El,
276 Lyon Street, - - - - Milwaukee, Wis.

Jacob Mielziner, B.H., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El,
Grandon Hotel, - - - - Helena, Mont.

Moses Mielziner, Ph.D., D.D., Professor Hebrew Union College,
3568 Bogart Avenue, - - - - Cincinnati, O.

Alfred G. Moses, Rabbi, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim,
Mobile, Ala.

Isaac S. Moses, Rabbi, Ahavath Chesed Shaar Hashomayim Con-
gregation,
118 East 55th Street, - - - - New York City.

Leon Maurice Nelson, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel,
The Arlington, 64 Montague Street, - Brooklyn, N. Y.

Morris Newfield, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El,
715 North Eighteenth Street, - - Birmingham, Ala.

Julius Newman, Rabbi,
315 Bissel Street, - - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Jacob Nieto, Rabbi, Congregation Sherith Israel,
1719 Bush Street, - - - San Francisco, Cal.

Myer Noot, Rabbi, Congregation Berith Sholom,
182 First Street, - - - - - Troy, N. Y.

Aaron Norden, Rabbi *emeritus*, North Chicago Hebrew Cong'n,
4639 Vincennes Avenue, - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Simon Peiser, B.A., Rabbi, Assistant Superintendent Jewish Or-
phan Asylum, - - - - - Cleveland, O.

David Philipson, B.A., D.D., Rabbi, B'ne Israel Congregation,
852 Lincoln Avenue, - - - - Cincinnati, O.

Jacob S. Raisin, B.A., Congregation Gemiluth Chesed,
Court Square, - - - - - Port Gibson, Miss.

Julius Rappaport, Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El,
87 Potomac Avenue (Wicker Park Station), Chicago, Ill.

William Rosenau, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Shalom,
825 Newington Avenue, - - - Baltimore, Md.

Moses Rosenstein, Ph.D., Rabbi,
1306 North Broadway, - - - Baltimore, Md.

Frank L. Rosenthal, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
Baton Rouge, La.

Isidore Rosenthal, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim,
138 East Clay Street, - - - Lancaster, Pa.

C. A. Rubenstein, M.A., Rabbi, Har Sinai Congregation,
1428 Linden Avenue, - - - Baltimore, Md.

Isaac L. Rypins, B.L., Rabbi, Mt. Zion Hebrew Congregation,
763 Holly Avenue, - - - St. Paul, Minn.

Bernard Sadler, Rabbi, Montefiore Congregation,
813 Commercial Avenue, - - - Cairo, Ill.

Samuel Sale, Ph.D., Shaare Emeth Congregation,
5115 Westminster Place, - - - St. Louis, Mo.

Marcus Salzman, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai B'rith,
62 North Main Street, - - - Wilkes Barre, Pa.

Max Samfield, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel,
81 Market Street, - - - Memphis, Tenn.

Tobias Schanfarber, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Maarabh,
4049 Grand Boulevard, - - - Chicago, Ill.

A. Schapiro, Rabbi, Congregation Beneh Abraham, Portsmouth, O.

Max Schlesinger, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Emeth,
334 Hudson Avenue, - - - - Albany, N. Y.

Emanuel Schreiber, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel,
260 Seminary Avenue, - - - - Chicago, Ill.

Samuel Schulman, Rabbi, Temple Beth-El,
1144 Park Avenue, - - - - New York City.

Isaac Schwab, Rabbi, Congregation Adath Joseph,
Sixth and Jule Streets, - - - - St. Joseph, Mo.

Morris Sessler, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel,
354 Church Avenue, - - - - Woodville, Miss.

Joseph Silverman, D.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El,
9 West 90th Street, - - - - New York, N. Y.

Abram Simon, B.L., Rabbi, Temple Israel,
1117 South Thirtieth Avenue, - - - Omaha, Neb.

George Solomon, B.A., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation,
205 Harrison Street, - - - - Vicksburg, Miss.

M. G. Solomon, B.L., Rabbi,
Care of S. Burnet, Greenwich and Barclay Streets,
New York, N. Y.

Solomon H. Sonneschein, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple B'nai Yeshurun,
810 Pleasant Street, - - - - Des Moines, Ia.

Wm. Sparger, Cantor, Temple Emanu-El,
73 East 90th Street, - - - - New York City.

M. Spitz, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai El,
P. O. Box 808, - - - - St. Louis, Mo.

Louis Stern, Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation,
1325 Tenth Street, N. W., - - - Washington, D. C.

Joseph Stolz, D.D., Rabbi, Isaiah Congregation,
157 Forty-second Place, - - - Chicago, Ill.

G. Taubenhau, Rabbi, late of Congregation Beth Elohim,
403 2d Street, - - - Brooklyn, N. Y.

Abraham Traugott, Rabbi, B'rith Sholom Congregation,
850 North Sixth Street, - - - Springfield, Ill.

M. Ungerleider, Rabbi,
Cor. Twenty-ninth Street and Groveland Ave., Chicago, Ill.

H. Veld, Rabbi, - - - Brooklyn, N. Y.

Jacob Voorsanger, Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El,
1247 Franklin Street, - - - San Francisco, Cal.

Judah Wechsler, Rabbi *emeritus*,
828 South East Street, - - - Indianapolis, Ind.

Harry Weiss, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Emanuel,
213 East Seventh Street, - - - Pueblo, Col.

L. Weiss, Rabbi, Beth Israel Congregation, - Palestine, Tex.

Wolf Willner, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, Meridian, Miss.

Leopold Wintner, Ph.D., A.M., Rabbi, Temple Beth Elohim,
210 Ross Street, - - - Brooklyn, N. Y.

Stephen S. Wise, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Beth Israel,
233 No. Twenty-fourth Street, - - Portland, Ore.

Samuel Wolfenstein, Ph.D., Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum,
Cleveland, O.

Louis Wolsey, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel,
917 Center Street, - - - Little Rock, Ark.

George Zepin, B.A., Rabbi, Bene Israel,
212 West Cedar Street, - - - Kalamazoo, Mich.

Martin Zielonka, B.A., Mt. Sinai Temple,
P. O. Box 756, - - - El Paso, Tex.











